Author:
Morrissey, Paul

Title:
The globalisation of higher education in East Asia : reputation management and converging governance

The Globalisation of Higher Education in East Asia: Reputation Management and Converging Governance

Paul Morrissey

A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the requirements for award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Social Science and Law.

Centre for East Asian Studies, May 2010

Word count: 87,500

Abstract

This research is located within the globalisation debate; in particular, it seeks to illuminate how the influences of globalisation are perceived in particular settings and locations, with particular reference to East Asia. For the purposes of this study, higher education (HE) is taken as an instance of globalisation: the study explores how globalisation is operationalised and determined in changes in governance, and takes the position that a convergence of governance is evident in the case study institutions.

The study attempts to address this question via a comparative study of four public universities, three of which are in the greater China, and one in the UK. The empirical research is focused at the heart of the institution, at the level of the faculty, where the strategic and the operational collide. 26 middle managers were asked about their perceptions regarding operational changes at their institutions, and about the motives which they considered relevant to these changes.

The study detects an international dimension operating within HE, which has strengthened during the current decade. At least some of the present environment in which the respondents were working was reported as now being global in nature, and I argue that decisions taken because of this global environment represent the process, or one dimension of the process, of globalisation. The respondents seemed particularly aware of, even anxious about, global rankings as a measure of institutional reputation; they suggested that they were involved in a variety of strategies which revolved around enhancing reputation; these centred on the core activities of research and teaching, attracting high quality staff, and promoting an international environment. I argue that these activities reflect a convergence of operations, driven by common motives, though context is of great importance regarding the extent of this convergence.

Key words: globalisation, internationalisation, convergence, governance, reputation management

Acknowledgements

There are many I would like to thank for their help in the writing of this study. I start with my supervisors: Professor Ka Ho Mok, Mr Tim Hill, Professor Yongjin Zhang, Professor Roger Dale and Professor Jeffrey Henderson. I would particularly like to thank Ka Ho Mok: without his encouragement, I would not have started the journey; and without Roger Dale's guidance, support and patience, I would never have completed it.

I owe a debt of gratitude to the many academics, particularly in China, who gave of their time to me so generously. I do not know what motivated the Taiwanese official, to whom I wrote a speculative e-mail, to organise access for me to so many well-placed academics at an important institution; I do know that it was a crucial piece of good fortune, which did so much to shape the direction of the research. I received equal hospitality and assistance on the mainland, and in Hong Kong. Without the kindness and assistance from the above mentioned, the field study would not have been possible.

I also want to thank my family, particularly my wife, Helen, for her unfailing support. Not only has she acted as guide and manager on most of the field visits, but she has assisted in many material ways, such as in transcription of the many hours of interviews. My children, Katie, Christina, and Matthew, expressed interest and encouragement throughout my study and assisted me with their knowledge of all things digital.

My friends at the University of Bristol have been of immeasurable support. I particularly want to thank Wending Huang, John Pella, Ren Kai and Baojing Chan for their friendship and support throughout. During one particular year, we were a community of researchers, sharing one another's ideas and commenting on each other's writing.

Finally I would like to acknowledge Su Huei Chun, who I met in Exeter in 2004. Huei Chun introduced me to academic research, and started me on this journey.

Author's Declaration

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the University's Regulations and Code of Practice for Research for Degree Programmes and that it has not been submitted for any other academic award.

Except where indicated by specific reference in the text, the work is the candidate's own work.

Work done in collaboration with, or with the assistance of, others, is indicated as such. Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author.

Signed.....Paul Moratey.....Date.....28-3-2011

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Why should the reader find this thesis interesting?

In 2008 I had been invited to meet with a number of senior staff in a university in East Asia. What struck me was the explicit nature of the project in which they were all involved: they wanted to improve the position of the university in terms of the major global league tables, and to do this, there was a carefully planned phalanx of changes which were being implemented in operations at the university, changes which were affecting many of the staff I spoke to. A couple of months earlier, I had been at a UK university, where the Deputy Vice Chancellor had implied (in his conversations with me) a similar project, had implied a similar need for that institution to be ranked at a certain place in these tables if it (the university) was to achieve its ambitions. I was also struck by the similarity of motives which appeared to be driving operational changes, and the similarities of practices which were evolving. It became quite clear to me that both motives and operations might well be worth exploring, and that exploration of motives and operations is the basis of this project. It occurred to me that globalisation might be in action here, and my interests in both globalisation and higher education (HE) came together.

My visit to the first-named university, in East Asia, was the moment when this project was born. It was that moment when so much that I had heard, in the nine universities I had visited in the scoping part of this study, crystallised into a theme, a hypothesis. The hypothesis itself was born from a number of puzzles. Why does it matter to these people who find themselves in positions of responsibility that 'their' university should be in the top 500, or top 100, or top 10? Was it always so? What does a 'good' positional ranking confer to the university? Why does it appear to matter to a similar degree whether one was in Hong Kong, Royal Holloway or Harvard? Are university operations changing in response to these perceived needs or goals? Note the use of the present tense here: I am interested in a contemporary phenomenon.

Very importantly, I interpret positional ranking as a proxy for *reputation*. It is not logical to assume that at the university ranked Number 1 in the world, all students are

the best students, that all teachers are the best teachers, that every piece of research is the best piece of research, but few would challenge the notion that a high rank is desirable, because of the reflection on the image of the university; this may be important for very practical reasons. And in my conversations with HE personnel in East Asia and the UK, an acceptance that reputation is something well worth seeking seems to emerge, for its own sake. Reputation is conferred by high-rank positioning, and is the meta-goal.

So what is the hypothesis for this study? It seems to me that there is now a global quest within HE to protect or enhance university reputation, and that this quest has resulted in a convergence at the operational level. Thus, **globalisation, reflected in the search for reputation, and the acceptance of a common measure of reputation, is driving convergence in the governance of world-wide universities, making universities more alike.** Clearly, to test for convergence requires a number of case studies, and it is for this reason that four universities, each in a different national setting, constitute this study. If I can demonstrate that there is convergence, then there is a prima facie case for causality: my intention is to show that we can observe globalisation through the instrument of reputation.

There are many studies about globalisation and HE (for example, Dale 2000, Marginson et al 2002, Mok 2007, Vaira 2004, Yang 2003), the debate in which this thesis is situated. This literature has many instances of unclear meanings and relationships, and I attempt to clarify those meanings in this project. This study hopes to contribute to the puzzle regarding the power of globalising forces: are such forces enough to change behaviours in distinct polities, causing convergence, or do the frameworks of distinctive national institutions allow for distinctive evolutions of responses to globalising economic forces (see, for example, Vaira 2004: 483)? There is, then, a duality to the study: I am looking at ways in which globalisation shapes HE in particular ways, but I also recognize that in response to this 'shaping', HE produces a further dimension of globalisation, which is the quest for reputation. This reinforces globalisation, producing a new, common recognition of what is 'good'.

My claim is that this thesis will extend those literatures by providing empirical evidence of an instance of globalisation. HE makes a useful case study two reasons. Firstly, HE is a global enterprise and a clearly defined area of economic and social activity.

Secondly, HE is born of the nation state, often using the national language and subject to its national structures and institutions; this makes comparison between Western and other systems possible. Added to these reasons, from a practical point of view, the sector is relatively accessible for someone in my position. I claim that the view I provide is a refreshing one, because in the instance, or example, that I have chosen to study, my view is that of an outsider; those on the inside of the wood can be distracted by trees.

It will be clear from the above that if I research into the area of operations in HE, then I am straying into the area of governance, and specifically the governance of HE; of course, by straying into this area, I also hope to make a contribution to its literature, that is, relating to the convergence of governance in HE. And it is here that I make the claim of having the outsider's view: most of the literature about the governance of HE is written by those who work within HE (see, for example, Enders 2004, Mok 2006b, Slaughter & Leslie 1997). My outsider's view carries the danger of ignorance, but the opportunity of a fresh approach.

1.2 What will the reader learn once s/he has read this research?

My claim is that s/he will be presented with the idea that the economic environment in which (some parts of) HE operates is now global in nature, and that *decisions taken in response to this global environment* represent the process or a dimension of the process of globalisation; s/he will be presented with the idea that global league tables have been central to stimulating the competitiveness within HE, and that this is linked to the competition between nations. I further suggest that global league tables are one of the factors which are providing new motives to manage institutional reputation, and that managers in the four HE cases reported on here, whether in Europe or Asia, are involved in developing mechanisms which revolve around enhancing reputation. I further claim that the result of an enhanced competitive environment and the efforts to enhance reputation at those four individual institutions has resulted in a convergence in a number of senses, where common underlying principles and operational effects are in evidence. And since this is a comparative study, the reader will also learn of the significance of national and institutional contexts: HE institutions remain distinctive, different from one another, and bounded by their national contexts.

1.3 Why is this study important?

It is a particularly interesting time to be commenting on this area, just as we enter an era when the appeal of the market has been somewhat diminished by the events in global financial markets in 2008. Indeed, the turmoil in the markets may have wider implications for neo-liberal philosophy and practice which have underpinned the global economic system of the past quarter of a century. In a confusion of factors which are guiding practice in HE, it is important to try to identify those elements which are dominant; only then can we ask whether these elements should be dominant, in view of the effects they may cause.

Enders suggests that our understanding of globalisation is still in its infancy (Enders 2004: 361). Other scholars suggest that there is a tendency to make sweeping generalisations in the field of globalisation without sufficient empirical evidence (Busch 2000, Yang 2003); this is one of those studies which hope to address the issue of *a paucity of the empirical*. The intention here has been to investigate the effects on the practices and performances of academic work, and to assess the micro-dynamics within chosen institutions, which may result as a consequence of the international dimension; Enders is one of those scholars who posits that these micro-dynamics have been neglected while sufficient studies have centred on macro level policy making (Enders 2004: 361).

Macro-level policy studies certainly add to our understanding of globalisation, but they may not be sufficiently fined grained to be able to lever apart regional activity. For example, in his attempt to 'take the temperature' of HE governance dynamics across the globe, King conceptualises global university governance as influenced by three global templates or blueprints, respectively an NPM (New Public Management) template, a template of systemic diversity, and a template of economic competitiveness (King 2009). King's perspective is essentially western, and specifically 'anglo': though he does make references to European HE, and to other global regions, his references and evidence are drawn from the US, the UK, and Australia, and from organisations such as OECD and the World Bank. His writing reveals misunderstandings regarding Asian contexts: he claims, for example, that in Taiwan, amongst other nations, "several older

private institutions take up the majority of overall (HE) provision" (ibid: 25), which I believe to be erroneous (see Chapter 6). Further, he asserts that the 'developmental state' approach in East Asia "is increasingly undermined. State economic development societies increasingly adopt to globalisation and its governance practices". I believe this claim is supported by very little evidence.

A further opportunity which the research allows is contact with some of the agents of the process of governance change and their reactions to the process; some of these voices are rarely heard. Some of those voices are very interesting for their own sakes. Scholars have detected a 'melancholia' in many of the writers who try to analyse the current trends and directions in which the HE sector appears to be headed. Hey, for example speaks of the tones of 'grief and loss' which appear in many of the analyses (Hey 2009). I assume Hey is referring to a multi-layered loss: a loss of autonomy, a loss of power, of place in the world in terms of status and security, perhaps even a loss of innocence, as the market place continues its onslaught into the world of the academic. I interpret these reactions as the consequence of the superimposition of the bureaucratic managerialism of New Public Management (NPM) upon a professional/peer/collegial ethic (which will be touched upon later in this chapter), resulting from the erosion of trust and the change to the contract as preferred work-relationship, which has itself produced changes in governance. The negative emotions suggested above are not confined to the West; during the course of my interviews with Asian practitioners (as part of the empirical work for this thesis), anger, irritation and disappointment were expressed. Referring to the attempts to raise international reputation at his place of work, a Taiwanese professor complained to me: "I think it's despicable. I don't like the process and the values attached to that." I have heard Western academics saying much the same thing. Here is another reason why this study is important: it allows an opportunity to contribute to the emotional debate which circulates through the field of HE.

The state is a central component in this study; it is a major variable. It is no contradiction that this research, regarding the globalisation of HE, has been conducted via the nation state framework: of course, "the contemporary university was born of the nation state" (Ending op. cit). I have looked at four autonomous systems; they are distinct from each other; further, the systems cross regional qualifications architectures. It is significant that I am comparing these systems globally; I have looked to see

whether faculties/colleges are changing in similar ways, and have found that external forces are driving the process of change. Where departments are not changing in similar ways, then other forces must be uppermost.

1.4 How did I become interested in these 'areas'?

In this section, I use the term 'area' in two ways: firstly, in its geographical sense, and then in the sense of a topic of study. In this thesis I have chosen to focus on East Asia, or more precisely, greater China, for two sets of reasons. The first set of reasons has to do with the region's rising economic and political importance, and the second with the fact that in terms of empirical studies of convergence, there is little in the literature regarding this region. Regarding the region's rising economic and political importance, there is a great deal of literature which informs us about the new world order following the Second World War, and the emergence of a multi-polar world (for example, Ohmae 1990). Many of the nations in the region have seen rapid and sustained economic growth, either in the immediate post-war (World War II) period, such as Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan, or in the case of the PRC (People's Republic of China), in the post-Mao period. Japan, PRC, and the 'Asian Tigers' have enjoyed enviable growth rates, though there have been periods of economic difficulty, and Asian economic models and systems have been the subject of much scholarly attention (see, for example, Drysdale 2000, Kim 2000, So and Chiu 1995, World Bank 1993). One of the unifying elements of these rapidly developing (some now considered mature) economies has been their engagement with other economic poles, and their integration into the global economy. This context makes East Asia particularly apposite for a study of convergence, since their recent history may be said to embody the process of globalisation; and if, as many of the above scholars claim, globalisation is Western, then it is very interesting to test for it in Asia.

The second set of reasons for focusing on East Asian case studies revolves around the relative paucity of literature on the convergence of HE systems outside US and European system; there are a few exceptions, such as those provided by Mok (see, for example, Mok, 2006, 2007). For example, regarding the impact of rankings on American, European and other systems, there has been considerable research (see for example, Hazelkorn 2007), but there is a need for information from outside the current centre of the academic world to establish the extent of globalising convergence. And

there is scant research on convergence at the operational level in Asia, though there is some, such as that provided by Lucas' work in Hong Kong (Lucas 2006). There is a significant quantity of literature about East Asia, Singapore and China, but it does not explain the motives behind governance changes.

1.5 Which polities and institutions did I choose to study?

I decided to study three Asian and one European polity (I use the word polity here rather than nation, since Hong Kong is a part of the PRC, though in many ways it is self governing: this is so in regard to HE). I chose greater China, namely the People's Republic, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. These provided great contrasts in political configuration and size, whilst sharing the same culture. These polities are self-consciously different: Taiwan and Hong Kong do not wish to be like China. I considered it important to choose polities which exhibited very different historical and institutional frameworks in order to test whether globalising forces could overcome these frameworks. After all, one could argue that the PRC HE system is essentially Russian in origin; the Taiwanese system originates from the US, and that of Hong Kong, from the UK. And there was the practical consideration that they were relatively close and well connected, which would assist in the logistical factors of time and resources. I then chose the UK, which had a long tradition in university development, as a reference point, a base line, from which I might attempt to analyse the developments elsewhere.

For each nation represented in the study (PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong and UK), a case study university was selected with two criteria in mind: firstly, the case study would represent a top ten university within each nation, and secondly, each chosen case study would have unique features would allow greater illumination of the research questions. Thus, of the 9 universities visited during the scoping study, I judged that Institute of China (IoC), the Institute of Taiwan (IoT), the Institute of Hong Kong (IoHK), and the Institute of the United Kingdom (IoUK) (here all anonymised) each had distinctive qualities which would add to the study's findings. IoC was a very large institution which was a focus for national investment, that is, one of an identified elite; IoT was the flagship university for the nation, which had strong and direct links with the Ministry of Education (MoE); IoHK had strong colonial links from the past which gave it a unique character, and had recently developed an interesting Faculty model; IoUK represented

the smaller institution which had a very traditional, western style of governance, and which appeared to have resource issues. This purposeful sampling follows Creswell's notion of 'selecting cases which show different perspectives on the problem or process under study' (Creswell 2007: 75).

1.6 What are the concepts which underpin this study?

Care needs to be taken in the use of many of the terms used in this study; many are used loosely in the wider literature. There are four which are worthy of some consideration in this Introduction, as they are central to the whole, and are conceptually related: namely, globalisation, internationalisation, neo-liberalism, and reputation. I have chosen to address two other concepts, that of governance and convergence, in the section that follows.

Firstly, then, the study is grounded in the concept of globalisation; from the many definitions written by scholars, I choose to reproduce Yang's here, for reasons which will be explained in a later section:

> "Globalisation is the result of the compression of time and space that has occurred since advanced technology allowed the instantaneous sharing of information around the world, leading to a cross-border flow of ideas, ideologies, people and goods, images and messages, capital and financial services, knowledge and technologies, creating a borderless world economy. It has a material base in capitalism and an ideological genesis in neo-liberalism." (Yang 2005: 28)

Yang's insistence that globalisation has direct links with global markets and the Neo-liberal project, is central to this study: neo-liberalism will be defined below, and investigated more closely in the chapter which follows. But here it will be useful to draw attention to the difference between the terms globalisation and internationalisation.

Within this study I use the terms 'international dimension', and 'internationalisation', interchangeably, to denote processes within HE. This should be distinguished from the wider sense in which it is used, where internationalisation refers to bi-lateral or multi-lateral connections and arrangements between individual nation states (see, for example, Archer 2001); in the case of HE, these connections and arrangements are usually at the level of the institution. When Marginson and Considine (2000) claim that 'universities are the most globalised of institutions' are they actually referring to their international nature? Perhaps it is not surprising that many of the scholars who write about the

internationalisation of HE, which I interpret as the internationalisation of individual universities, draw attention to the fact that the term has to be used with care:

> "The phenomenon of internationalisation in higher education has, even though frequently investigated during the last three decades, been addressed as unclear, vague, ambiguous, and obscure, and has not become clearly conceptualised in an educational practice." (Whilburg 2005)

Knight (2003) provides a useful discussion about the meaning of the term internationalisation, which will be examined in Chapter 2, and suggests that it may mean many things to different user groups. We will also see that for Elkin and his co-authors, it is about engagement in similar activities (Elkin et al 2005). For other writers, internationalisation sums up academic mobility and a range of partnerships between different institutions in different countries. For yet others, it brings to mind branch campuses and the like, or is perhaps associated with distance learning. Still other writers see internationalisation as an inclusion of other cultures or the global dimension into an HE curriculum, or a term that describes the trade in HE. There will be a more detailed consideration of internationalisation in the next chapter, and some of the literature (for example, Taylor 2004, Elkin et al,op.cit.) will also be referred to in the following section which relates to convergence; but now it is important to return to the term 'neo-liberalism'.

One of the external vectors driving globalisation is neo-liberalism. This politico-economic philosophy has been in the driving seat of the world economy for the last twenty five years; it advocates the reduction of the role of government, the opening of national markets, free trade, flexible exchange rates, deregulation, the transfer of assets from the public to the private sector, the transfer of the disciplines of the private sector into the routines of the public, and an international division of labour. All of these elements have had an impact on governance. This ideology is implicitly international, and has very effectively introduced (or at least strengthened) a number of new elements, including marketisation, into HE. As I demonstrate in more detail in Chapter 3, one of the features of the market is the need for information: quality assurance ratings and league tables are but two of the information formats encouraged by NPM (New Public Management), a political expression of neo-liberalism. I argue that these information technologies impact upon a university's reputation, particularly at the international level and particularly for some universities; thus reputation has become even more significant than was previously the case.

Frombrun and Van Riel note that many disciplines contribute to the academic debate concerning reputation; there are contributions from economics, strategic management, marketing, organisational studies, sociology and accounting (Frombrun and Van Riel 1997: 10). These range from economic perspectives that stress the conception of reputation as a resource, to a sociologically informed perspective that emphasises that reputation is the outcome of socially shared impressions of the institution or business in question[1]. Fombrun conceives reputations as strategic assets that "produce tangible benefits: premium prices for products, lower costs for capital and labour, improved loyalty from employees, greater latitude in decision making, and a cushion of goodwill when crises hit" (Fombrun 1996: 57). It is through this lens which I use the word here, though not all of the criteria listed here will apply to institutions of HE; thus reputation can be viewed as an intangible asset with a potential for value creation (Roberts and Dowling, 2002). Nevertheless, the sociological view that 'reputations constitute subjective collective assessments of the trustworthiness and reliability of firms' (Frombrun and Van Riel 1997: 10), offers no inherent challenge to the economic perspective.

In their study in the field of HE, Rouse and Garcia use the word 'recognition' interchangeably with 'reputation'; thus they discuss '(institutional) sstrategies that lead to increasing.... the highest levels of recognition' (Rouse and Garcia 2004: 139). Moodie sees the quest for 'the highest levels of recognition' as an 'intellectual arms race', in which universities are competing for a place in the knowledge economy (KE) (Moodie 2004:74). In her work relating to the changing nature and direction of research work in universities, Lucas uses both terms, that is, 'recognition' and 'reputation'. She uses the latter term in describing the aspirations of the institution: for example, she concludes that 'reputation was being built primarily in relation to research' at the universities under study (Lucas 2006: 94); and she uses the term 'recognition' in discussing individuals' struggles for recognition within a department (ibid: 164).

The notion of reputation, as used in this study, is an idea which is a part of the armoury of the market; the conditions for markets will be explored in Chapter 3. What this study

---

[1] Federkeil notes that the ascription of reputation is highly dependent upon social context and social groups, and can be made differently by different social groups (Federkeil 2009: 21). He also asserts that there is no such thing as reputation, only the reputation among a particular group of people (ibid:32).

is concerned with is whether this aspect of marketisation (that is, reputation building or reputation-competition) is exposing (all or some?) universities to respond to the same set of mechanisms. In so doing, are universities changing policy and practice, or governance, and do such changes represent convergence?

1.7 Why are convergence and governance central to this study?

Theories of convergence and governance are the axes, the hinges, around which this particular study revolves. Let's take governance first. Governance has been variously defined as "regimes of laws, administrative rules, judicial rulings, and practices that constrain, prescribe and enable government activity, where such activity is broadly….the delivery of a publicly supported service" (Heinrich & Lawrence 2000: 3); and as "the different modes of coordinating individual actions, or basic forms of social order"(Ending 2004: 372). Malpass and King's version, though simplistic, may also be helpful: "…governance is who decides what gets done, when and by whom" (Malpass and King 2009: 16). These definitions are insufficient to encompass the meaning of the term in the context of HE, and an attempt will be made to offer more robust meanings in Chapter 2, where, for example, the different scales of governance can be distinguished (Dale 2005); it is necessary because of the confusion surrounding the term. Traditional forms of comparative HE research have assumed that national systems are relatively closed; Enders suggests that this is being challenged by recent trends, and that governance studies may be a tool to construct pictures of, amongst other things, the effects of globalisation (Enders 2004: 370). King suggests that national governments are, in the current era, disposed to adopt the organisational and regulatory models of the world's leading economies and university systems, particularly those of the USA (King 2010: 38). It will be helpful to see how the theory of governance has evolved as a research tool, not least because the concepts therein will be related to the questions asked of respondents in the empirical part of this study.

Now let's look at convergence. Li argues that although convergence is not a coherent theoretical concept (Li 2005: 39), it is nevertheless a useful approach to the understanding of and theorising of the globalisation debates. According to Wilensky, convergence theory is "the idea that whatever their political economies, whatever their unique cultures and histories, the 'affluent' societies become more alike in both social

structure and ideology" (Wilensky 1975: xii). Kerr argues that convergence is a process where "societies…grow more alike…develop(ing) similarities in structures, processes and performances" (Kerr 1983: 3). Bennett posits that convergence is a condition of *becoming* rather than *being* alike (Bennett 1991: 219), and that the comparative method, pursued over the medium term, is a suitable analytical tool in the study of convergence.

Regarding the above, this study is interested in the 'structures, processes and performances' observable at the case study institutions, and will make a qualitative judgement as to whether these are becoming more alike, based on an analysis of the evidence gathered. Bennett (ibid) suggests 'the medium term' as the time period necessary for a comparative study; the empirical part of the study is only concerned with the present decade, that is, the first decade of the twenty-first century. I claim that sufficient data was gathered to enable firm conclusions about the evolution of practice in the four case study universities; further, the data explicitly shows the nature of the baseline differences between the institutions before the process of convergence. And regarding the qualitative nature of the data which I intend to present, I align myself with those theorists who insist that convergence can be expressed in terms other than the quantitative.

A useful analytical tool for this study is Hay's differentiation of convergence into four 'senses', which he claims "is important if we are to acknowledge fully the theoretical insights and further potential of institutionalist analysis" (Hay 2000: 514). Hay's four senses are:

> "(1) Convergence in the pressures and constraints placed upon a particular political economy (*input convergence*);
>
> (2) Convergence in the policies pursued by (or the paradigms informing) particular states (*policy convergence*);
>
> (3) Convergence in the consequences, effects and outcomes of particular policies (*output convergence*); and
>
> (4) Convergence in the processes sustaining the developmental trajectories of particular states (*process convergence*)" (ibid)

Importantly, Hay insists that input convergence need not imply policy convergence, policy convergence need not imply output convergence, and output convergence need not imply process convergence (ibid).

A further useful analytical tool for this study is Stephen Ball's classification of convergence in relation to social policy. Ball distinguishes two types: he sees 'simple convergence' where 'the same policies are invoked in the very different national settings' and 'paradigm convergence' where there are 'policies of underlying principles, similar operational mechanisms and similar first and second order effects'. First order effects concern the impact on practitioners, practice and institutional procedures, and second order effects relate to the wider issues of social justice and patterns of access (Ball 1999: 198, cited in Li op cit: 35). This study is particularly interested in the 'underlying (policy) principles' and 'similar operational mechanisms', and the first order effects (the impact on practitioners, practice and institutional procedures) of Ball's 'paradigm convergence'; I do not focus on his 'second order' effects on social justice and patterns of access. Having looked at convergence in a general sense, we now move on to examine the literature regarding convergence in HE, and particularly the convergence of governance in HE, since this is the area in which most of the study is located.

There is a considerable literature regarding aspects of convergence of inputs, policies and outputs in HE; the literature does not necessarily use Hay's categorization (Hay 2000 op.cit). My intention here is to provide some examples of that literature, in order to underline some central themes. A starting point might be Vaira's discussion of the convergence arguments centred on the search for legitimacy and the various pressures upon universities to conform to certain organisational norms (Vaira 2004: 491-4). Vaira asserts that global trends (institutional and competitive) seem to corroborate the new institutionalist thesis[2] of increasing isomorphism in the HE sector. King offers three theoretical bases for the convergence of global governance: global economic competition, a world society theory of influential inter-government agencies, and a world society theory of influential networks of professionals (King: 2008: 68); all of these will be explored later in this piece.

---

[2] A representative theory here is the sociological version of neo-institutionalism, where a central thesis is that, due to external political pressure, increased professionalisation within a societal sector, or organisational uncertainty, organisations will become increasingly similar. These processes are referred to as coercive, normative and mimetic, or emulative, respectively. In other words, organisational adaptation is a change towards standardisation within a given organisational sector, e.g. higher education. DiMaggio and Powell (1983: 150) refer to this standardisation as a form of isomorphism, or structural homogeneity. (Stensaker and Norgard 2001)

At a comparative level, the convergence of HE has been theorised by Slaughter and Leslie in a study concerning policy direction of four national systems (though all were 'Anglo-Saxon'- Australia, Canada, United Kingdom and the United States) in the context of global competition. They found convergent policies in these areas: an emphasis on science and technology, a skewing of research towards the market, a channelling of students into market place curricula, attempts to lower course costs, and a perceived undercutting of academic institutions and faculty through managerialism (Slaughter & Leslie 1997). In more recent writing, King uses the term 'policy internationalism' to describe the increased convergence of policy approaches by national governments in many sectors (King 2009: 37); this is of course very similar to DiMaggio and Powell's 'iosmorphism' (op.cit: 1983). Regarding HE, he suggests that

> "There is thus a converging similarity of organisational form and structure in the higher education 'field', reflecting the external influences of a range of processes: coercive, including regulatory; mimetic, copying others; and normative, including those values associated with the notion of modernisation." (ibid: 39).

We also find regional studies within the literature: in East Asia, already identified as a area of under-reporting, Mok provides more evidence of policy convergence, at a regional scale, in the way that governments interact with its HE systems: the traditional notion that governments play significant roles (The Developmental State Thesis) has been questioned (Mok 2005: 9). He contends that there has been a paradigm shift away from command and control government towards the language and ideas of the market place: innovation, profitability, entrepreneurial activity, competition and efficiency. He conceptualises that there are common themes surrounding education policy in (amongst other places) China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, involving reviews, reform, marketisation and privatisation (Mok 2003: 119). Mok is one of those writers who argue that these processes cannot be understood outside the local political and social environments. The term 'glocalisation', combining the sense both global and local factors, is used to emphasise how we can only understand national policy in the twin context of both global neo-liberalism and the local cultural context (Lucas 2006:11; Marginson and Rhoades 2002). However, my own findings in this study suggest the greater significance of the global over the local.

Within the literature are also national studies. In a study of 17 Australian universities, Marginson and Considine discuss the 'isomorphism of strategy' in the Australian context, which they see as a result of the market driven environment in which universities operate (Marginson & Considine 2000: 171); we should note that these writers define isomorphism as 'imitating behaviour, mimicking', and we should see convergence therefore as a quite different process [3](ibid: 176). Though operations rather than strategy are the focus of this study, these ideas may contribute to the understanding of the motives behind operational activity. There is another echo here of the literature regarding institutional theory, which is usually regarded as an explanation of similarity or 'isomorphism' in given fields of organisations (Greenwood & Hinings 1996: 1023). Marginson and Considine couch their findings in terms of governance, identifying five principle trends in governance in the 17 Australian universities in their study. In brief, these are: a new style of executive power, which enjoys a separation from the internal context, or that which is managed; structural innovations, such as senior executive groups; the emergence of a set of flexible management mechanisms, such as targets, incentives and plans; a decline in the role of the academic disciplines, and new methods of devolution (op.cit: 9-10).

Marginson and Considine regard these changes as indicative of a shift from collegiality and democracy to executive power. It is the executive who manage strategy and interpret external influences. The structural innovations they observe have created new bodies which have eschewed the "previous constraints of legislative forms and representative governance". The transformed, flexible management mechanisms appear to fit the purposes of the executive rather than those who might wish to teach and research. The role of the academic disciplines has been reduced, not only by the mechanisms outlined above, but also by the trend for cross-disciplinary schools and research centres, which have allowed an attrition of previous authority. And the writers regard the new methods of devolution as a part of the centralised control, not an antithesis to it (op. cit: 9-11). Perhaps we can see these trends as a coherent group; I

---

[3] We should be careful to note that isomorphism and convergence are not the same. For example, Vaira suggests that isomorphism stresses homogenisation/uniformity of organisational structures as a result of the same environmental pressures, whereas convergence concerns the tendency towards a common set of organisational patterns (Vaira 2009: 139).

would argue that these trends are the result not only of the massification of HE and the reduction (in many nations) of state support, but also its marketisation, a concept which will be developed in the next chapter.

At the institutional level, Taylor has studied strategic developments at four universities; the University of British Columbia (UBC), Canada; the University of Chicago, United States; the University of Uppsala, Sweden; and the University of Western Australia (UWA), Australia (Taylor 2004). His stated intention was to examine 'to what extent conventional planning theories and methodologies have been applied to the process of internationalisation' (ibid: 150), but he also presents examples of strategies held in common, which are driving institutional change. These are: the importance of effective management and leadership; an emphasis on effective costing, cost-benefit analysis, risk management, and investment appraisal in the context of more varied and less predictable income flows; the increased importance attached to functions such as marketing and counselling and support services; the importance of inter-departmental working; the application of modern technologies in administration; the importance of external fund-raising; the development of partnerships with other institutions; an enhanced awareness of competitive forces; the importance of staff development and training; an emphasis on interdisciplinary teaching and research; the development of new methods of delivery; and the recognition of the importance of customer care to support international students (ibid: 168).

Elkin is another writer who refers to convergence with regard to the internationalisation of HE institutions (Elkin et al, op.cit.). I cite this paper here not only as an example of convergence but also because it allows a clear view of what may constitute some of the features of internationalisation in HE. Elkin and his co-authors note that institutions engage in similar activities, and propose a model for measuring the extent of that engagement with a thirteen spoke 'wheel' (ibid: 319). The thirteen components are intended to summarise typical engagement activities[4]. They are: the presence of international undergraduate students; the presence of international postgraduate students; student exchange programmes; staff exchange programmes; other interaction by staff in an international context; internationally focused programmes of study;

[4] Not only does this model hope to assess engagement, but its authors also intend that it might be used as a tool to assist managers to extend their activities into areas of relative underdevelopment.

attendance at conferences; research collaboration; other recognized research activity; support for international students; institutional links; overseas curriculum and the presence of overseas trained staff (ibid: 326).

It is clear then, that there is some evidence for convergence in HE at various levels. This study hopes to make a theoretical contribution to the ideas about the convergence in HE by testing for a common praxis: the focus is on a convergence of practice and approach at the micro-level, rather than of strategy, values and norms at the macro level, though strategic motives may never be far away.

1.8 How did I collect my data?

I present two sorts of data here: firstly, that which is pertinent to the context of each national system, which I gathered through a literature review; and secondly, an empirical element, which I gathered through interviews. This empirical research, deemed to be lacking in the view of Marginson and Considine (op cit), is focused at the heart of the institution, at the level of the faculty, where the strategic and the operational collide. This point-of-collision between the strategic and the operational is an essential element of this study, because I was always interested in motives and operations, the latter (I assume) being influenced by the former. I posit that the faculty, or in those universities without faculties, the college or department, is the organ of institutional governance where strategy is translated into academic practice and professional experience, and that it is the interface between the executive (whether it be called senate, or council or senior management team) and student experience. Thus I directed my queries to deans of faculty, or those in a similar position, at each of the case study institutions.

1.9 How is the study organised?

The structure of this study revolves around its functional components of concepts, mechanisms, methods, contexts, analysis and conclusions. As will be explained further in Chapter 4, these components are related to the 'realist' theoretical approach which forms one of the foundation structures of this study, and is the underpinning meta-theory. Realists, or critical realists, insist that an hypothesis attempting to explain social outcomes can only be fruitfully explored within the unique contextual conditions where

the mechanisms under investigation pertain. The components of 'mechanisms (M), context (C), and outcome (O)' are vital to social explanation (Pawson 2000). That this is a study about globalisation is significant. As Marsh and Furlong insist, the putative development of globalisation is dependent upon the actions of agents, whether they are individuals or companies or institutions, and it is therefore a socially constructed process; the outcomes are shaped by the way that world is socially constructed: "it seems clear then that the transformative process is a realist one" (Marsh and Furlong 2002: 34). They also posit that there are clear methodological implications, pointing towards comparative analysis as a means of establishing differences between national responses (ibid: 34).

There are three parts to the study which follow this introduction. Part A deals with the concepts and mechanisms which underpin the study, and with the methodologies employed; it has three chapters. Chapter 2 engages with the notions of globalization, internationalization and governance. Chapter 3 seeks to illuminate the supra-national mechanisms now operating in the realm of HE. Chapter 4 considers the underpinning meta-theory, the research design, and the progress of the study. Part B consists of four chapters, each chapter referring to one of the chosen polities and its case study institution. The contextual development of each national HE system is examined in the first part of each chapter; the findings from the empirical study are analysed and presented in the latter part of each chapter. In Part C, the findings, or outcomes, are compared and analysed, and conclusions are drawn; it includes the comparison of the four empirical case study findings, and a conclusion which links the contexts and that comparison. Below, I summarise the content of each chapter.

1.10 A synopsis of the study

Chapter 2 is organised into three sections; permeating these sections is the significance of the Neo-liberal project, the re-fashioning of the post-war Order, and the adoption of governance styles of New Public Management (NPM). I discuss the debates which relate to the period and extent of globalisation, debates between 'sceptics', 'hyper-globalists' and 'transformationalists', and make the link between an increasing global integration and wider economic forces. I briefly review the literatures relating to Neo–liberalism, and examine the claims that this ideology has fostered the arrival of the

'competition state', which aims to "secure economic growth within its borders and/or to secure competitive advantages for capitals based in its borders" (Jessop 2002: 96). The notion that the knowledge economy (KE) as vital to the future of the 'competition state' is explored, as is the link between the KE and HE. This sets the scene for later discussions about competition between institutions and the perceived need for building, managing and maintaining reputations. I then employ ideas from education theorists (for example, Dale 2000) to make the connection between the neo-liberal project and a paradigm shift in the way nations have, or have had to, re-fashion the purposes and governance arrangements for education in response to supra-national social and economic forces.

In the latter two sections of Chapter 2, I engage with two literatures specifically relating to HE, internationalisation and governance. I explain how the term internationalisation is used by scholars. I suggest that, in the twenty first century, we can see a rather different international dimension from that of the preceding century, one which has shifted from being driven by internal motives within the institution to one which now has significant external vectors and pressures; these pressures are such that the internationalisation of HE may now be seen as a necessary strategy to enhance corporate reputation. Finally, I examine ideas relating to the development of theories of governance in HE. Some commonalities in the developments in governance are suggested, such as the shift of power away from academics towards other stakeholders. The pluri-scalar nature of governance and the growing importance of non-state actors (Dale 2005) are identified as notions around which this study revolves.

There are three sections in Chapter 3. The first section examines the nature of markets, or quasi-markets, as they relate to HE. Sections 2 and 3 explore those mechanisms of governance at the level of the supra-national, spawned by the Neo-liberal project, that is, the World Trade Organisation, and global league table. I first address the concept of market conditionality in HE, and comment on its various components. I dwell particularly on the growth of performance-related information as a key component for the student/consumer and other stakeholders, and the immediacy and simplicity which rankings and league tables might have in the mind of these consumers.

I then discuss two supranational mechanisms, identified above, which I consider may be influencing HE governance. I examine how WTO/GATS (World Trade Organisation/

The General Agreement on Trade in Services) provided a framework which stipulates that national providers should have no priority in the supply of services, and examine the concerns of scholars regarding the effects GATS was likely to have on social and educational policy. Moving to a consideration of global league tables, I view the league table as a mechanism of the market and by association, of the Neo-liberal project. I examine how two global league tables, namely the Shanghai Jiao Tong University's Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU), and the Times Higher Education Supplement's (THES) World University Rankings, are constructed and how they are critiqued by scholars. I conclude with the hypothesis that the power of the league table rests in the possibility that the metrics of the tables might become the priorities of individual HE institutions.

Chapter 4 is organised into three sections. The first presents the meta-theoretical and philosophical positions taken. The second section presents the research questions and the research design, and is where I consider the methods employed in collecting the data. The final section charts the progress of the research. In the first section I explain why I embrace 'realism' or 'critical realism' as the meta-theoretical foundation for the study, and how the theorem 'O = f (M.C)', where outcomes (O) are a function of mechanisms (M) activated in particular contexts (C), is pivotal for this thesis. Thus the context for each polity under discussion becomes central to the argument; what the study asks is whether global forces are powerful enough to overcome the local. I discuss the ontological assumptions inherent to critical realism that social phenomena exist outside our knowledge of them, and that social reality is differentiated, structured, and stratified. In the second section of Chapter 4, the research questions for the empirical part of the study are presented. The research questions are:

- Can we observe the process of globalisation in East Asia, and can we perceive HE as an instance or mechanism of globalisation?
- Is there a 'new' supra-national competitive environment which promotes globalisation in HE?
- Does this 'new' supra-national environment lead to an imperative for universities to build/manage their reputations?

- Can we observe a convergence of governance in HE which results from this 'new' supra-national environment?

I explain that I chose a comparative study because it offers the possibility of attributing causality, that the case study method is adopted to allow deep contextual analysis, and that the primary research tool is an interview schedule; the same research tool was used to gather data at four chosen case study universities in three nation states and a Special Administrative Region (HKSAR). I explain how two data sets were to be collected: one set pertaining to the context for each study via a literature review and documentary analysis, the other pertaining to my perceptions of governance changes in a recently enhanced competition-environment in HE, via the above-mentioned interview schedule. The construction of the research instrument is then detailed. The second section then comments upon case study and interviewing methodologies and the study's ethical credentials. The final section traces how the study developed, explains the data analysis techniques and reflects upon data collection.

Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 focus on the four case study nations and institutions: the UK and the Institute of the UK, PRC and the Institute of China, Hong Kong and the Institute of Hong Kong, and Taiwan and the Institute of Taiwan. These chapters share a common structure: each chapter is divided into four sections. Following a brief introduction, the second section presents data which attempts to portray the context of each national system, using the following data template:

- What time periods might represent the stages in the development of HE?
- What are the political, economic, social and technological factors driving these HE systems within these time frames?
- How have these factors shaped the present situation in these HE systems?
- How has governance evolved during these time periods?
- What are the current forces which are shaping HE, and is the 'competition state' significant?
- What are the current drivers of governance change?

The third and fourth sections of Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the data from the empirical part of the study. That my queries are divided into two sections reflect my interest in both the context and the effects in context. Thus section 3 considers the contexts which have emerged from the literature: a context of competition, a context of league tables, and a context of organisational change. The first query examines the suggestion emerging from the literature that the nation state is increasingly a site of competition with other states. The second and third queries examine whether there was any evidence at the case study institutions that there was awareness of or influence from the league tables in general and global league tables in particular, and whether re-organisation or governance change was proceeding, and whether such changes, if they existed, might be related to the aforementioned competition and league tables. Section 4 comprises five queries, which present data relating to styles of management, strategies for reputation building, the research culture of the institution, the process of internationalisation, and the teaching culture at each of the case study institutions.

In Chapter 9, I analyse the empirical findings from the previous four chapters. The Chapter is organised into eight sections which follow the data template described above, that is, the template used to organise the empirical analysis of the Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. My analysis regarding the first three sub-sections is consonant with the literature which sees competition between nation states as a fact of 'neo-liberal life'. And for many of my respondents, the issue of league tables 'had moved up the agenda' and there was a perceived need to achieve 'visibility' for their own institutions, though at IoC, the aura of competition appeared to be of a different order; that aura did not appear to be of the same magnitude. I also argue that with regard to university reorganisation, the increasing awareness of league tables have encouraged a situation where there are now common organisational templates for all to follow.

In the five sections that follow, I firstly argue that by looking at the experience of the Dean, we can see a number of converging processes at different universities in different national settings. I also argue that my respondents were seeking to enhance their reputation of their university, their strategies revolving around the core activities of research and teaching, attracting high quality staff, and ensuring an international environment; these involved the built environment. There were a number of clear similarities in the direction of research management, and the strategies used for this purpose at the institutions under study. Senior managers were involved with the

selection of institutional partners and the encouragement of international activity. However, I found fewer pointers to convergence with regard to the management of teaching activities as a means to enhance reputation.

In Chapter 10, I draw the conclusion that the economic environment in which (some parts of) HE operates is now global in nature; that decisions taken because of this global environment represent the process or a dimension of the process of globalisation; that global league tables have been central to stimulating the competitiveness within HE, and that this is linked to the competition between nations. I further suggest that managers in the four HE cases reported on here, whether in Europe or Asia, are involved in developing mechanisms which revolve around enhancing reputation, and further, that a convergence of governance is evidenced.

1.11 A summary of the argument

Essentially then, this thesis is looking at the globalisation of HE, and testing for convergence of operations; I have taken HE as an instance of globalisation. This has been attempted through an assessment of the governance of HE in locations in East Asia and the UK. Above, I have used this definition of governance: "... who decides what gets done, when and by whom" (Malpass and King 2009: 16). I suggest that this might better fit this particular study by adding another interrogative "... who decides what gets done, when and by whom, *and why*", since the motives here are essential to the argument. The data collected and analysed points to a convergence of motives and practice in the universities in the study. This convergence has come about as a result of the development of a common metric, the global league tables, which have their own set of rules, and which have developed their own momentum; and we have to see these league tables as part of the apparatus of the Neo-liberal project and NPM. For the universities under study, or rather, for their managers, it was important for them to be highly placed in these tables, since 'good' positional ranking appears to confer a 'good' reputation; this is important for a number of reasons, explored in Chapter 9. It is in this area of managing or building reputation that I identify a mechanism around which the universities under study converge. In order to manage reputation, my conclusion is that university staff at the level of the faculty, are required to think and operate, in terms of the organisation of research and teaching, in increasingly similar ways.

Within the wider globalisation debate, I therefore put myself alongside those 'globalists' who see the disempowerment of the nation state and the formation of a single consumer culture across societies (Dale 2000, Fukuyama 1992, Waters 1995), rather than with those who argue that there is heterogeneity of national responses to global processes (Schmidt 1999, Friedman 1999), whilst recognising that national systems remain distinctive. This study suggests that for many nations the effects of global economic forces are not 'path dependent', that the peculiarities of national systems do not shape strongly national arrangements, and that, on the contrary, there is an equifinality, where global mechanisms result in increasingly common outcomes.

Part A: Concepts and Mechanisms

Chapter 2. Underpinning Concepts: Globalisation, Neo-liberalism, Internationalisation and the Governance of HE

In this chapter, I look at the notions of globalisation, internationalisation and governance in HE, examining them in greater detail. Regarding globalisation, the intention here is to make the link between global economic integration and wider political-economic forces, which sets the scene for later discussions about competition between institutions and the perceived need to maintain reputation. I also provide a more detailed analysis of the literatures pertaining to the process of the internationalisation of HE, and will suggest that the twenty-first century environment requires a new perspective on this process. Also examined here are notions of governance in so far as they relate to HE; from theorising about governance in HE we see the links between the aforementioned wider political-economic forces, and the sorts of practices which are now evidenced in the twenty-first century university.

2.1 Globalisation

"We live in a world of overlapping communities of fate, where the trajectories of countries are deeply enmeshed with one another" (Held 2004 4). Held's statement acknowledges an increasingly interdependent world, an interdependency that has been much reflected upon. I posit that this interdependence is as relevant to HE, if not more so, than to any other area of economic activity; indeed, HE has been described as the single most globalised sector of endeavour (Marginson & Considine 2000: 8). It is this connectedness (of HE) which requires the consideration of global environments below.

Over the last decade, scholars and writers have increasingly discussed the nature and import of globalisation at political, economic, social and cultural levels (see, for example, Held and McGrew 2000, Schirato and Webb 2003); one scholar has demonstrated that the references to globalisation in social science journals have increased exponentially during the 1990s (Smith 2006: 5). Some of these references go beyond the political, economic, social and cultural to include technical or legal aspects and others issues relating to social justice and human rights (Held 2004).

Academics and researchers do not agree on many aspects of the form or direction of globalisation: for example, Vaira points out that some describe globalisation as a 'meta-myth' (Vaira 2004: 484). There have been debates about its significance, and how it is to be defined. Held and McGrew are amongst those scholars who have attempted to identify categories of 'sceptics', 'globalists' and 'transformationists' in the globalisation debate (Held and McGrew 2000: 3). Mattelart, for example, takes a sceptical view: he considers that today's world situation is merely a continuation of trends which have developed over the last 400 or 800 years, and that the current situation is simply an intensification of the European (colonial) dominated global systems of the 19th century (Mattelart 2000: 75). The philosopher Kant wrote over 200 years ago that "we are unavoidably side by side", referring to the level of international integration that he perceived (and wished to encourage further) at the end of the 18th century (Kant 1795). Held agrees with the sceptics: "It needs to be pointed out that there is nothing new about globalisation per se" (Held op cit: 2); he argues that there have been many phases of globalisation in the past, including the spread of empires and world religions, the Age of Discovery, and the development of trading blocs (ibid: 2).

In contrast to sceptics, 'globalists' posit that "globalisation is a real and significant global event" (Held and McGrew op.cit: 3). Further, 'transformationists' consider that the effect of globalisation will be to create a new stratified global order of winners and losers in the world, requiring a revision of the existing nomenclatures of developed and developing nations (Mok 2006); whether this process of stratification could be observed within the environment of HE will be of interest in this study. Yang's definition of globalisation (in the introductory chapter) clearly reveals his position on the "globalist" side of the debate; it underlines his belief that the market is a cornerstone of the process, and it stresses the link to neo-liberalism. 'Hyper-globalists' argue that increasing interaction between different nation-states and the freer interchange of capital, goods, services, people, technologies, information and ideas, suggests an inevitable convergence of human activities (Ohmae, 1990; Fukuyama, 1992); the notion of convergence is, of course, central to this study.

There is little disagreement, however, about the forces which are driving the process: the electronic revolution, the development of global markets in goods and services and of supranational bodies, and the rapid growth of migration and the movement of peoples. Of these factors, it is the rapid flow of capital that is seen by many as *the*

determinant in the social, cultural and political issues of sovereign states (Mattelart 2000: 75). And in this context arises a further discussion among scholars. Where globalists see the disempowerment of the nation state and the formation of a single consumer culture across societies (Fukuyama 1992, Waters 1995), others argue that there is heterogeneity of national responses to global processes (Schmidt 1999, Friedman 1999).

There are some important points which have great relevance to this study. If globalists such as Yang (ibid) are right, how are the processes of globalisation revealed in the governance structures in HE? This is clearly a key question for this study. Further, will the transformationist's argument, that globalisation creates a new stratified global order of winners and losers, be revealed in the strategies of HE institutions? Will Fukuyama's claim that there has been "a shift in the balance between state and market strongly in favour of the latter" (Fukuyama 2006: 121) be evidenced by this study? Highly relevant is the question regarding the disempowerment of the nation state and the formation of a single consumer culture across societies (Fukuyama 1992, Waters 1995); a convergence of practice might counter the claims of heterogeneity of national responses to global processes (Schmidt 1999, Friedman 1990).

That market forces are integral to globalisation is essential to an understanding of the phenomenon; while some see globalisation as an inexorable process of global economic integration (Fukuyama 1992), others see it as a deliberate policy project which celebrates the market as an economic saviour (Yang op.cit: 28). Beyond dispute is the fact that both the Anglo-Saxon world and greater China are bound up in this process, as evidenced by Harvey and others (Harvey 2005), thus suggesting some legitimacy for the case studies used here.

2.1.1 Neo-liberalism

Liberalisation and neo-liberalism are terms used to describe the political-economic philosophy that promotes the free market. The neo-liberal philosophy, with its roots in an intellectual movement promoted by scholars such as von Mises (1949) and Hayek (1960, 1976), advocates the reduction of the role of government, the opening of national markets, free trade, flexible exchange rates, deregulation, the transfer of assets from the public to the private sector, the transfer of the disciplines of the private sector into the routines of the public and an international division of labour. Some scholars argue that we can trace the first manifestation of the philosophy back to the 1975 fiscal crisis in New York, and the subsequent financial remodelling (Harvey 2005: 44-48). This political-economic agenda is often referred to as the Washington Consensus (Bayliss and Smith 2001: 189, Stiglitz 2002: 20), though it might be argued that it is more of an ideology than a consensus.

A major theme emerging from the political-economic aspect of globalisation is the increased significance of competition. "National competitiveness has increasingly become a central preoccupation for governance strategies across the world" (Watson and Hay 2003: 299). Scholars such as Jessop (2002), Cerny (1990) and Ball (2007) argue that during that last quarter of the century, many nations have evolved their political and economic structures to become 'competition states', which aim to "secure economic growth within its borders and/or to secure competitive advantages for capitals based in its borders" (Jessop 2002: 96). This has been achieved by a complex structural coupling, "an accommodation between accumulation and regulation" (Ball 2007: 3), which has resulted from the failure of previous 'command economies'. These systems had produced a shared condition known as 'the overloaded state' (Cerny 1990: 221), where capital was unable to play its full role in the economic system because of a series of crises in the social, financial and political fields (crises such as demographic change, unemployment, ungovernability etc.) (Ball 2007: 4). The competition state has emerged not as a unified project but as a piecemeal dismantling of previous arrangements, always limited by the "political reach of regulation" (Ball op cit: 5). Importantly for this study, Ball points out that such arrangements emerge from and within existing state structures, and that therefore the response varies greatly from one nation to the next.

Returning to the Washington consensus, this powerful agenda has its critics: Stiglitz, for example, suggests that the implementation of this agenda in many nations around the world has led to a situation where there is "global governance without global government" (Stiglitz 2002: 21). One might exemplify this in relation to the financial services industry, which has, during 2009, been the subject of criticism as being globally active (and perhaps globally irresponsible) but only nationally regulated. The Washington Consensus has achieved this (partial) implementation of neo-liberal policies by favouring treaty devices such as the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) (Fukuyama 2006: 121). The significance of such treaties that relate to HE will be examined in the following chapter.

The treaties mentioned above are of central importance to the debate surrounding globalisation. Some scholars refer not simply to "neo-liberalism", but to "neo-liberal institutionalism", particularly those scholars with a focus on International Relations (IR) (see, for example, Bayliss and Smith 2001, Held 2004). Neo-liberal institutionalism has its roots in the functional integration and regional integration scholarship of the 1940s and 1950s; it is an approach that supports the development of supranational institutions in order to promote peace and prosperity between nations and recognises a growing global interdependency that made such an approach rational (Bayliss and Smith 2001: 189). The approach is also part of a wider debate with proponents of "neo-realism", whose theory of IR has more to do with a preoccupation with power and the survival of states in a competitive international system (ibid: 190). Bayliss and Smith provide a useful definition of the word "institution":

> "Institutions are seen as persistent and as connected sets of rules and practices that prescribe roles, constrain activity, and shape the expectations of actors. (These) may include organisations, bureaucratic agencies, treaties and agreements and informal practices that states accept as binding." (Bayliss and Smith 2001:189)

At this point, we will turn to the notion of values. Some supranational institutions have, at their heart, the development of values (for example, UNICEF, ILO, UNDP, WFP, ICBL, HRW etc) in the sense that human development and social justice are either implicitly or explicitly central to these institutions. However, the neo-liberal interpretation or re-configuration of these institutions has led to debates coursing through the globalisation literature which revolve around the problems of social integration and social justice. Held summarises the issues which surround this part of the debate (Held 2004: 6-10):

- Have social welfare and working conditions suffered?
- Should we equate globalisation with Americanisation?
- Has the environment suffered as a result of globalisation?
- Is the authority of the nation state jeopardised?
- Are national cultures threatened?
- Have inequalities been compounded?
- Is corporate power enhanced to the detriment of other societal stakeholders?
- Are developing nations the losers in the process?
- Do established political powers stand more to gain as a result of globalisation?

It has been in response to some of these issues that anti-globalisation groups have fought in the streets of Genoa, Washington, Cancun and London, though Held argues that in fact none of these negative scenarios are necessarily the outcome of the global processes under discussion (ibid: 6-10). But what does concern Held, and many others (see, for example, Stiglitz 2002) is the relationship between globalisation and social integration: he describes this relationship as "problematic" (ibid: 3). Where Stiglitz suggests that the intergovernmental economic institutions need reforming (Stiglitz 2002: 214-251), Held takes this argument further, positing that what is needed is the development of supranational functions not only in economic and security matters, but also in human welfare and environmental matters (ibid: 79), thus broadening the debate away from the narrower political-economic agenda of the Washington consensus, towards an agenda for a wider social democratic vision.

The debates about globalisation need not occupy more of these pages; suffice it to say that, whilst its economic footprint gets deeper, many scholars pose questions as to its effects. Does it limit the ability of nation states to set policy? (Yang op.cit: 31) Does it degrade sovereignty? Does it reflect exclusively Western popular cultures and symbols and widen disparities? (Altbach 2001: 2) The philosopher Michael Polanyi regards the freedom of neo-liberalism as a poisoned chalice, liberating us from everything, "even from obligations towards truth and justice." (Polanyi and Prosch 1975: 14)

Bearing in mind these anxieties expressed above, we turn to the perceived effects of the neo-liberal project upon HE. Two areas of impact are immediately apparent. Firstly, the 'competition state' gives an added importance to the research capabilities of the university; as Slaughter and Leslie theorise, institutions across many nations are engaged in a system of 'economic capitalism', where their research power is harnessed to the needs of industry in terms of science and technology innovation. The university is seen as a major player in 'knowledge economy' (KE) (Slaughter and Leslie 1997), though King asserts that this view is not necessarily well-evidenced (King 2010:37). Following on from this increased importance of the research capability of the university is the competition between institutions for research funds. Lucas asserts that as a result, 'Universities…are struggling to prove their worth and prestige to their potential funders, government and others" (Lucas 2006: 27). Linked to these notions is the apparent emergence of a 'global model' (EGM) of the research university, based on the template of the most successful universities in the developed economies (King op.cit: 37); King also explores how the governance of universities is increasingly shaped by global forces (King 2009). Vaira posits that the global competitive environment has produced HEI's which are 'allomorphic' in organisational terms, that is, HEIs demonstrate different variants of a common 'institutional archetype' (Vaira 2004: 503).

The second area where neo-liberal globalisation impacts upon HE, is in the retrenchment of welfare provision. The neo-liberal state promotes economic international competitiveness through cutbacks in social expenditure, economic regulation and taxation and consequent advances in privatisation and labour flexibility; it sees the provision of education as a "public good", paid for through taxation, as unjustified[5]; it sees the re-ordering of education on a user-pays basis, with deregulated institutions competing for student "clients". Much has been written about the New Public Management (NPM), which we might view as the expression or incorporation of neo-liberalism into the public sector of those nations adopting that philosophy, and its associated doctrines of public accountability and organisational best practice (see, for

---

[5] King uses the term 'public choice theory', which suggests that governments rather than markets create inefficiencies (King 2009:40)

example, Hood 1995 and Vaira 2004[6]). The basis of NPM lies in reversing the two cardinal doctrines of the previously accepted paradigm of progressive public administration (PPA)[7]; that is, lessening or removing differences between the public and the private sector and shifting the emphasis from process accountability towards a greater element of accountability in terms of results (Hood 1995: 93); and results, one could argue, are the fuel for league tables and reputations.

To survive in this changed world order, universities must become customer-focused business enterprises (Currie and Newson 1998). As soon as the nation state acts as a player in the new global marketplace (Currie 2003), universities are encouraged to act in market-like ways; and changes begin to emerge in funding, management and function (Yang op.cit: 41, Mok and Welch 2003). And the complexities of globalisation on HE are further revealed in the terms of supra-national bodies such as the WTO.

Some argue that intellectual traditions are at risk from such market-led refashioning (Altbach 2001). Yang argues that since the 1990s, HE systems have seen dramatic restructuring in response to the globalisation discourse, involving a redefinition of the relationships between the university, the state and the market, "with a net result of the reduction of institutional autonomy" (Yang op.cit: 29).

There are some important points in the discussion above which has great relevance to this study. Should we view HE as part of the emergence of the 'competition state' which aims to "secure economic growth within its borders and/or to secure competitive advantages for capital based in its borders" (for example, Jessop 2002: 96)? Should we expect the responses to these forces to differ from nation to nation? Is it so that universities are encouraged to act in market-like ways; and are changes to funding, management and function emerging (Yang op.cit: 41, Mok and Welch 2003)? Have universities become customer-focused business enterprises (Currie and Newson 1998)? Are we witnessing "global governance without global government"? (Stiglitz 2002: 21).

---

[6] Vaira describes a collection of rationalized myths characterizing the world polity whose core features and contents can be synthesized as the minimalist state, managerialisation, and the knowledge society (Vaira 2004: 488).

[7] PPA was the result of conscious decisions by " politicians, bureaucrats and professionals operating in a bureaucratic environment and intending to work in such a way as to further the public interest" (Le Grand & Bartlett 1993:1)

And central to this study, what patterns of governance are emerging at the micro-level as a response to globalisation? These questions will circulate throughout this study; the following chapter will dwell on some of the 'associates' of neo-liberalism: marketisation, the WTO, and league tables. But before these aspects are considered, it might be instructive to dwell on how educational theorists view globalisation and its impact at the macro level; the focus of this study is, after all, education. These theorists illuminate what is perhaps a historic view, and introduce a raft of concepts which will be discussed later. It should be pointed out that the education sector as a whole will be referred to here, rather than HE in particular.

2.1.2 Education Theory and the Market Paradigm

I posit that to garner views from education theorists with regard to the debates above is consistent with a study which centres on HE. These theorists view globalisation and its impact on education in different ways (Dale 2000: 447); perhaps increasingly convincing in light of what has been expressed in the previous section are approaches which explicitly recognise the role of the neo-liberal economic dynamic, as discussed in the previous section. But we will begin with an approach which takes a different stance, the Common World Education Culture, or CWEC approach. This approach emphasises culture, and sees globalisation as an ineluctable process towards cultural homogeneity, as a cultural end point, a telos; it is an approach which leans towards the neo-liberal institutional view, celebrating the influence of International Governmental Organisations' (IGOs) and Non Governmental Organisations' (NGOs) educational agencies (some NGOs work at an international level and are referred to as INGOs).

The CWEC approach was developed by John Meyer and associates at Stanford. It "seeks to demonstrate the existence and significance of a hypothesised world culture" (ibid: 447), where models are developed universally. In this approach, 'education' is seen as a resource; 'world' connotes an international society made up of nation states. Central to the view is the dominance of a Western value system based on Modernity including notions about rationality, justice and progress. These theorists note the emergence of standardised categories of curriculum, and see the tailoring to national histories as merely incidental. Mass schooling cements the nation state, transforming it into the Modern, where the needs of society and industry can be met. The proponents

suggest the models of education have become relatively standardised across the world (ibid: 432), and terms such as isomorphism, standardisaton, and convergence are the dominant themes of the CWEC discourse.

Also at the core of this approach is the obligation of the centre to pursue rational progress. As Dale puts it: "These norms and values inform and shape the nature of states as well as their policies" (ibid: 441), and he suggests the influence of IGOs in the process of that informing and shaping. He cites Boli and Thomas, emphasising the ways in which cognitive constructs are shaped globally by organisations such as UNESCO:

> "When we speak of culture as global, we mean that definitions, principles and purposes are cognitively constructed in similar ways throughout the world....the core of world culture is a large number of INGOs that concentrate on economic or technical rationalisation. It is peculiarly invisible...and sets standards, discusses problems, disseminates information ...and writes codes of ethics..." (Boli and Thomas 1997: 173).

But Dale has reservations about the CWEC approach. Not only does he ponder whether the approach recognises a process rather than an outcome, but he is concerned that these theories seem to be based on secondary 'Ministry' data rather than on ground research. Further, he regards the CWEC approach as problematical regarding its theory of agency. There appears to be no information as to how the much-heralded standardisation has occurred; he claims its legitimacy is self-generated. As we have seen, CWEC proponents cite IGOs and I/NGOs as the mechanisms by which ideas and practices are spread, but Dale presents a number of powerful arguments to demonstrate how their spread is "politically rather than cognitively propelled"(Dale op.cit: 447):

- The proponents miss the point that I/NGOs and IGOs are themselves created by states. Dale uses the United Nations as an example of a body spawned by the winners of a world war for their own purposes

- Dale sees the ceding of aspects of sovereignty to supranational bodies as strategies to maintain States' dominance over forces they cannot control, rather than bowing before the strength of rationalities presented by professional advisory groups

- He also points out that I/NGO and IGOs should not be seen as a homogeneous grouping; we should be aware that each has a history, an agenda, an

organisational structure, different relations to nation states, and that they may just as often compete as co-operate

- He questions more generally the authority of science and rationality, suggesting that where there are competing scientific claims, it is the political factor that is likely to determine which competitor will win

- With the rise in significance of "governance" in recent decades, Dale sees the rise in influence of those who regulate state activity at the expense of the technical and professional specialists. Education has become more important as a political issue in recent times in many countries, and the influence of the "professional", who may once have been significant in the development of systems and structures, has been wrested from him by his political masters

- Dale also draws attention to the "coerced adjustments" of World Bank and IMF programmes, which often require nations to re-direct emphases towards Education, and how it is funded, illustrating once again the dominance of the political over the cognitive (ibid: 443-6).

Dale has therefore attempted to develop a new approach, which he terms a Globally Structured Agenda for Education (GSAE), in which he sees policy as locally mediated, and where education is seen as a topic rather than a resource. In a somewhat Foucauldian statement, he asserts that the "purpose is to provide answers to questions about what goes on in that area and the activities known as education and it regards the agenda that frames those questions as central to answering to them." (ibid: 428). For Dale, 'Global' implies social and economic forces operating supra-nationally and trans-nationally to breakdown, elude or override national boundaries (ibid: 429), and is based on a perceived paradigm shift which has changed the role of states, the nature of the problems facing those nation states and their capacity to respond to these problems (ibid: 441), particularly in ceding some powers to supra-national bodies. There are strong echoes here of some of the ideas referred to in the earlier section of this chapter: for example, the challenge to the nation state (Currie 2003), and the reduction of the role of government (Fukuyama 2006: 121), and the arrival of pluri-scalar governance agency (Dale 2005).

Dale frames the problem of managing education as just another problem for the state, which is a capitalist system and is therefore driven by profit. His disagreement with the CWEC approach might be summarised as the difference between the conviction that developments in education represents the formation of a single culture across societies, in contrast to his conviction that these developments represent the formation of a single consumer culture across societies (Fukuyama 1992, Waters 1995). Other scholars claim that education itself is associated with the accumulation of capital, providing infrastructural support, contributing to social order, and providing the system as a whole with legitimacy (Robertson, Bonal and Dale 2002: 474). Under these influences, policy priorities change and need re-prioritising, and are sometimes contradictory

It is worth comparing the major departures in these two approaches (CWEC and GSAE). These major departures concern the nature of globalisation, the understanding of what constitutes education, and its relationship to globalisation. Regarding the nature of globalisation, the CWEC approach is about the spread of western values; GSAE is about capitalism (ibid: 436) characterised by hyper-liberalism, governance without government, and commodification, centred around the three major regional groupings of Europe, America, and Asia:

> "They compete fiercely to advance the set of global agreements most favourable to them but recognise that they are all ultimately dependent on the existence of a world that is safe for the pursuit of their own profits, at the expense of others" (ibid: 436).

This, Dale asserts, is distinct from any form of globalisation that has gone before. The following section leaves globalisation behind for a moment, and dwells on a term with which it is commonly confused, that is, internationalisation.

2.2 Internationalisation

In the introductory chapter, I noted that the term internationalisation used in this thesis refers to the arrangements between HE institutions, and it is a term which has to be used with care. In this section, I suggest how the term is most frequently used, and how it may be timely to refine the term to express a changing situation.

Why should we be careful in the use of the term? Knight posits that "internationalisation is interpreted and used in different ways in different countries and by different stakeholders" (Knight op cit: 6). A report into internationalisation from HEPI (2004) echoes many of the themes mentioned by Knight (see Introductory Chapter), identifying five discernable elements or trends; it helps to clarify what the term encompasses. Firstly, the number of students studying outside their home countries has risen. The large numbers of students from Asian countries are noted in the report: of 1.5 million foreign students worldwide, 8% are Chinese. The second trend is the rise in staff mobility: the term "brain circulation" is gaining currency. Thirdly, trans-national higher education (TNHE) has increased, "defined as universities in one way or another setting up shop in overseas locations" (HEPI 2004: 1), with the United States of America, the UK and Australia cited as the most actively engaged. Further comment will be made regarding TNHE later in this study. A further theme is a concentration on business and IT courses. Lastly, it seems clear that international collaboration in research has increased substantially.

De Wit (de Wit 2002) provides a comprehensive overview of the development and use of the term internationalisation and other related terms in the previous ten years but also provides a warning that:

> "... as the international dimension of HE gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purpose... A more focused definition is necessary if it is to be understood and treated with the importance that it deserves. Even if there is not agreement on a precise definition, internationalisation needs to have parameters if it is to be assessed and to advance HE. This is why the use of a working definition in combination with a conceptual framework for internationalisation of HE is relevant." (de Wit 2002: 114)

Arguing that a new definition is needed, Knight suggests the following:

> "...the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education." (Knight 2004: 2)

The terms used in this definition are carefully explained:

> "The term process is deliberately used to convey that internationalisation is an ongoing and continuing effort. The term process denotes an evolutionary or developmental quality to the concept."

These terms 'international' and 'intercultural' and 'global' are intentionally together to reflect the breadth of internationalisation. 'International' is used in the sense of relationships between and among nations, cultures, or countries. 'Intercultural' is used to address the aspects of internationalisation at home. Finally, 'global', which Knight sees as a very controversial and value-laden term, is included, to provide the sense of worldwide scope. The three concepts 'purpose, function and delivery' are also meant to be used together. 'Purpose' refers to the overall role and objectives that post-secondary education has for a country or region. 'Function' refers to the primary tasks that characterize a national post-secondary system and also an individual institution. 'Delivery' refers to the offering of education courses and programmes either domestically or in other countries (Knight 2004: 3).

She feels that this new definition encompasses the situation where the national/sector level is extremely important, that is, where a range of government bodies may have an influence on HE. These bodies may include departments of education, foreign affairs, science and technology, culture, employment and immigration. The significance or increasing significance of the sector level suggested here by Knight, will be pertinent to this study. Will evidence emerge which demonstrates the influence of the sector level upon institutional operations? Will institutional managers cite 'government bodies' as shaping internal policy? How does the influence of national government differ from one administration to another, in Hong Kong, Taiwan, PRC and the UK?

Within the literature there are also queries about the purpose, expected outcomes and benefits of internationalisation, and of the values which may underpin it, of the main stakeholder and beneficiaries. What, Knight asks, are the consequences, the implications, the unintended results? Is it with us for the foreseeable future, is it sustainable? How are institutions responding to internationalisation, and what are the resultant policy implications (Knight 2004: 6)? Other scholars ask similarly fundamental questions about the nature and consequences of internationalisation. Mok, for example, echoes Knight's enquiries, and extends them:

- For whose benefit should HE be internationalised?

- For what purpose should HE be internationalised?

- Should internationalisation be on the agenda for contemporary Universities?

- Does internationalisation matter to students and other stakeholders in the society?

- For what purposes should contemporary universities exist?

- What university education should we commit ourselves to? (Mok, 2007: 437)

I would argue that the anxieties expressed above reflect something which is missing from the literature regarding the internationalisation of HE. When Mok asks what kind of university education we should believe in, and who should benefit from such an education, he is touching on a raw nerve which is troubling many in the sector. The writers above may have ignored the influence of the market, and of a far more powerful global vector than that to which Knight refers; in short, perhaps they have underestimated globalisation.

The notion of globalisation clearly goes beyond the processes of internationalisation as expressed above, towards a transcendence of the national and local by political, economic, social and technological forces. I posit that the 'international dimension in HE' is a force which is causing tension and promoting change in governance practices within HE; and that this dimension is a consciousness born out of a pannier of elements which includes, as demonstrated above, the presence of international students and staff, and an increasing level of co-operative research activities, but also a politico-economic environment which supports an increasing trade in international students and an increasing mobility of staff, and last but certainly not least, the existence of global league tables for HEI's. Can we detect, in the twenty first century, a rather different international dimension from that of the preceding century, one which has been ratcheted-up, sexed up, to a new level? I also suggest that the international dimension has shifted from a position which was essentially driven by internal motives within the institution to one which now has significant external vectors and pressures; these pressures are such that the internationalisation of HE may now be seen as a necessary strategy to enhance corporate reputation, as a result of an anonymous process of globalisation. In short, I argue that the present internationalisation of universities is not the same internationalisation of a decade ago.

In the section which follows, a different element of HE is examined, also introduced in Chapter 1: governance. Though there may be few direct links between governance and internationalisation, I posit that there may be links between governance and globalisation, as will now be examined.

2.3 Governance

This section attempts to dwell further on the meanings of the term 'governance' and to show how the theory of governance in HE has developed to include a number of elements recognisable in the decision making process. As was indicated in the section regarding convergence, many of the elements are bound up with the processes of globalisation, competition, marketisation and neo-institutionalism. I suggest that recent 'anglo' literature points to the following trends:

- The diminution of the autonomy of the scholar, and collegiality within the institution, towards greater central, executive authority

- The development of sophisticated supervision, or the distancing of national authority, replacing direct steering from the state

- The increasing influence of commerce and informal methods of consultation and communication within the institution, away from a more formal arrangement of consultation with the academic community

- Rapidly changing 'revolving door' governance, or continuous managerial re-invention, in contrast to a more stable and traditional collegiate approach

- The arrival of other stakeholders, such as the business and enterprise community, who may have added other voices to the process of governing the university, other than that of the scholars

- The recognition of discrete functions within governance activities

- The identification of various geographical scales of influence which accentuate the existence of the supra-national and the global, as well as acknowledging the local and the national

Within the debates surrounding HE governance, it might be instructive first to dwell on the traditional organisation of individual institutions. As will be discussed in later chapters relating to historical contexts, the European university has, from medieval times, celebrated the idea of a 'Republic of Scholars', designed to protect the scholar, the faculty and their academic freedom from external influences, and to allow a prominently academic voice in the process of collective decision making (McDaniel 1996, Marginson & Considine 2000) [8]. But in the latter part of the twentieth century, this perceived autonomy of the individual academic has been diminished by the growing centrality of the institution, as the institution has moved towards a 'stakeholder organisation'. In this organisation, academic staff have become one stakeholder amongst several in the process of strategic decision-making, and where more decisions are made centrally and from above. The creation of central authorities within the institution, managerial infrastructures, new funding arrangements, expanded budgets, wider consultative boards and increased political interest have followed the massification of institutions, and have had an impact on the governance arrangements, moving away from the collegiate towards the hierarchical (Bleikie 2009, Lucas 2006: 93). In this respect it is important to mention the development of mechanisms for Quality Assurance (QA), which Skolnik considers to be associated with those with an affinity with neo-liberalism; he also asserts that QA is associated with a redistribution of influence away from faculty staff and a reduction in the diversity of academic thought (Skolnik 2009). Marginson and Considine note that rapidly changing 'revolving door' style of governance, which continuously re-invents itself in a flurry of changing structures and titles, characterises the changes of the last two decades (Marginson & Considine 2000: 235). McDaniel's is one study which explores the shift in the institution's autonomy in relation to the state (McDaniel op.cit).

It is equally instructive to look at the term 'governance' from a wider perspective. Kjaer notes that the term governance has been used as synonymous with government, that is, the act or manner of governing, but in the 1980s political scientists referred to the term as distinct from government, and as including civil-society actors. She claims that there are different definitions of the word governance and that these are used in

---

[8] Some writers note that the process was not free of stakeholder-ism, such as in unpublished work by Ian Wei, UoB, relating to the medieval University of Paris.

different sub fields of political science, referring to different debates. (Kjaer 2004: 3). The term has been used by one scholar in the sense of reforming the public sector, by another in the emergence of global political problems requiring global solutions, and yet another in the systematic comparison of political systems. What appears to link these different meanings is that they all appear to refer to something broader than Government (the institution rather than the process). King's comments on global governance might be useful here; he posits that we might define global governance as a worldwide process involving coordination through the establishment of rules, norms, markets and standards by both government and non-government agents (King 2010: 35).

But returning to the development of a theory of governance in HE, Enders suggests that an understanding of the former could play a role in a study such as this:

> "An account to look for the contribution of HE policy studies to the overall development of governance theory can rather serve to put our field into a larger context and to see to what extent this context might serve our further purposes of studying the international dimension in HE." (Enders 2004: 370).

He sketches the evolution of the theory, commencing with governance in the narrow sense of top-down "steering" in HE by government, noting the ideas of resistance and subversion which were to emerge, and the studies which highlighted the peculiarities of HE, some which even questioned its 'governability'. Clark's triangle of market, state and collegiate forces was an early attempt to broaden the discussion away from political control (Clark 1983). There was the development of 'steering from a distance' in the 1980s, as some European nations became uneasy about direct control of the system. It represented a departure from "top-down" government steering by means of legislation, prohibition and regulation, towards more autonomy for institutions of HE (for example, as in the Dutch case explored by Kickert, 1995) and resulting in major institutional, legal, financial and planning changes. This directed the attention of theorists to alternative forms of governance, reflecting the fact that from that point in time, Government was to be only one of the participants in a complex network of many interrelated actors, mirroring the processes evident in the individual institution, mentioned above.

Later work has focussed on the increasing sophistication of government interactions with HE and the wider geographical dimensions of governance, as mentioned in the

Introduction (Vaira 2004, King 2009). Jongbloed argues that government policies have increasingly strengthened the networks between business, universities and government by using a wide range of facilitation mechanisms that seek to intensify formal and informal interactions between the agents in these networks (Jongbloed 2005). In an attempt to promote an understanding of global political and economic forces that shape national HE systems, Marginson and Rhoades suggest a global, national, and local (glonacal) heuristic, in order 'to re-conceptualize social relations and actions globally' (Marginson and Rhoades 2002). Dale suggests that we must recognise that states govern by means other than policy and with others, in pointing to the pluri-scalar nature of educational governance. He posits that activities, or functions, of educational governance can be divided into the four categories of funding, provision, ownership and regulation, that these functions may be carried out by any of the broad set of agents, such as the state, market, community and household, and that these functions may be carried out at the different scales of sub-national, national or supra-national (Dale 2005).

Despite these important contributions, Enders quotes Mayntz's (2003) view that there remain significant areas in governance theory that require further study, due to the regionalisation and globalisation recognised above. One of these areas is that of "micro- dynamics and effects in the actual practices and performances of academic work" (Mayntz 2003: 9), and it is in the area that this study hopes to contribute.

It might now be fruitful to summarise the current meanings of the word governance. Marginson and Considine prefer a broader definition to the narrower versions above. They suggest the term encompasses internal relationships, external relationships, and the intersection between those relationships; they underline the significance of the term by arguing that "when we are talking about institutions of HE… governance is always present." Governance, they posit, is concerned with the systems of decision making, the patterns of authority, the relationships with external stakeholders, and importantly for this study, they claim that governance provides and affects the conditions which enable teaching and research to take place (Marginson & Considine 2000: 7). Enders expresses this complexity thus:

> "(The word governance) is now often used to indicate a new mode of governing that is distinct from the hierarchical control model, a more cooperative mode where state and non-state actors participate in mixed networks. Attempts at collective problem solving outside of existing hierarchical frameworks of the nation-state have contributed significantly to this shift in the meaning of the term governance. The second "new" meaning of the term governance is much

> more general, and has a different genealogy. Here governance means the different modes of coordinating individual actions, or basic forms of social order" (Enders 2004: 372).

This study will use both of the meanings above within its boundaries. In the empirical part of the study, the latter meaning will be employed, referring to the corralling of academic practice by new arrangements, should these be reported; it will be necessary to suggest a model of faculty governance in order to proceed with that empirical study. But more generally in the study, there will be a consciousness of that range of agents, including non-state, which may be influencing strategic and operational thinking in HE.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has engaged with the notions of globalisation, internationalisation and governance. Circulating within the discussions above are the tensions concerning the challenge to the nation state (Currie 2003, Ending 2004), the reduction of the role of government (Fukuyama 2006), the arrival of supra-national mechanisms (Robertson 2009), and the possibility of an equifinality, where different national trajectories lead to a common destination.

A number of literatures have been drawn upon. Scholars have demonstrated that we can observe a variety of ways in which governance in HE is converging (for example, Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Mok 2005, Enders 2004, Lucas 2006, Marginson & Considine 2000 Dale 2005). Regarding the debates surrounding globalisation, the contributions of some of the major contributors have been analysed (for example, Yang 2005, Held 2004, Mattelart 2000). The link between globalisation and the neo-liberal project has been examined (Fukuyama 2006, Harvey 2005, Stiglitz 2002, Jessop 2002) and the impact of globalisation upon the directions which education has taken has been considered (Dale 2005).

In the first section above, Dale points to the significance of two factors which appear to be shaping education: firstly, the market, and secondly, supra-national mechanisms. Indeed, the concept of the marketisation of HE and other areas of the public sector, is a further idea which circulates through the chapter; I argue that it is not possible to understand the developments within HE without a firm grasp of this development. The marketisation of which we speak is a result of the globalisation of the last three decades,

which is itself linked to the arrival of supra-national mechanisms; these two factors will be the foci of the chapter which follows.

Chapter 3. Markets, Mechanisms and the Supra-national

Reference was made above to the emergence of the notion of geographical levels of influence in governance theory (Dale 2005); it is at the level of the nation-state that competition has been introduced to promote a more open market structure in HE. We can only understand the developments which will be referred to in this chapter against the background of the marketisation which has been introduced into the operations of HE since the 1980s, discussed in the previous chapter. A clear reference point here is Burton Clark's famous 'triangle of coordination' (Clark 1983). The triangle suggests the national authority, the market and the academic oligarchy as the three pressures that shape, through their interaction, the way in which an HE system is delivered. But it is at the level of the supra-national, where important developments have occurred during this century, which this chapter is most concerned with, because they link with the idea of globalisation, the focus of this study. There are clear conceptual links between the neo-liberal project and the mechanisms which are under investigation.

In this chapter there are 4 sections. The first section examines the nature of the markets and introduces the idea of marketisation, a much referred-to feature in the literature relating to HE. Sections 2 and 3 explore those mechanisms of governance at the level of the supra-national, spawned by the Neo-liberal project, that is, the World Trade Organisation, and global league tables. There is then a concluding section.

3.1 Marketisation

It is well to point out that before discussing markets in HE, there is not a single HE market, but many. As Jongbloed observes:

> "There is a market for students (undergraduates, postgraduates, doctoral students), a market for research staff, a market for lecturers, a market for research grants and scholarships, a market for donations, a market for graduates, a market for company training, and so on." (Jongbloed 2003: 111)

In this section I will be referring to the combination of all of these markets, but I should also point out that in the empirical and analytical chapters of this study, I ask selective

questions about some of these individual markets, particularly the markets for students, staff and research grants (though the latter is rather indirectly addressed).

In recent years, we have witnessed the introduction of marketisation policies and market-type mechanisms in sectors previously characterised by a high degree of government steering (Mok & Lo 2009: 216). Many governments have turned to deregulatory policies and privatisation schemes as a means to 'free and facilitate' markets (Weimer and Vining 1999), allowing a degree of commodification into the system. These marketisation policies in HE are aimed at strengthening student choice and liberalising markets, with the stated objectives of improving the quality and variety of the services offered by the providers, that is, HE institutes. As such, marketisation is aimed at encouraging providers to pay more attention to their students, and to innovate in the areas of teaching and research (Dill and Teixeira 2000). Neo-liberal theorists would have it that, by emphasising competition and introducing performance-related reward schemes, marketisation policies have the capacity to increase efficiency in the sector, making institutions and students more aware of costs (Jongbloed 2005: 113).

In market-driven systems, there is more emphasis on the individual entity (i.e., the student, university and college), where decision making might be made on the basis of reliable information (Jongbloed 2005: 114). But one might ask, what types of information are available, and how reliable and accessible is that information? It is on the subject of market information, in the form of global league tables, that the third section of this chapter dwells upon.

But first we will first need to address the concept of a 'market' and see how far the concept is applicable in the HE sector. Markets are the intersection of buyers and sellers of products and services, capital, labour, land and commodities. Begg asserts that the 'market' is a shorthand expression for the process by which individuals' decisions about consumption of goods, companies' decisions about what and how to produce, and workers' decisions about how much and for whom to work, are all reconciled by the adjustment of prices (Begg et al., 1991: 8). If there is no intervention in this process, we refer to a 'free market' (Jongbloed op.cit: 111). The table below (from Onderwijsraad 2001: 41) suggests the elements which are necessary for markets to exist. Of course, HE must be seen as a quasi-market, rather than a conventional market, because universities and their stakeholders have always accepted the argument around 'the public good'; Le

Grand and Bartlett set out the differences between quasi and conventional markets (Le Grand & Bartlett 1993: 10). Nevertheless, I consider this a useful tool to analyse what has happened in the HE sector; therefore each element will be briefly and separately considered.

Table 1: Eight conditions for a market

'Four freedoms' for providers	'Four freedoms' for consumers
1. Freedom of entry	5. Freedom to choose provider
2. Freedom to specify the product	6. Freedom to choose product
3. Freedom to use available resources	7. Adequate information on prices and quality
4. Freedom to determine prices	8. Direct and cost-covering prices paid

Source: Onderwijsraad 2001: 41

Later in this chapter, one of the supply side elements, the freedom of entry into the market for suppliers, and one of the consumer elements, information on quality, will be examined in detail; both elements will represent the supra-national dimension. Before that, there will be a more general consideration of each element.

3.1.1 A free market for providers in higher education?

Freedom of entry is considered an important element for an open market. I will not dwell on this element here; suffice it to say that the section which follows, regarding the World Trade Organisation and the General Agreement on the Trade in Services, will show how at the level of the supra-national, legal mechanisms are in place to secure this 'freedom' in the nations under study. Private institutions currently operate in the PRC, in Taiwan, and in the UK.

To fulfil the conditions of a free market, institutions or faculties must be able to control the content of their teaching or research, or to have 'the freedom to specify the supply of programmes', as a market theorist would put it. In order to judge how far institutions fulfil this aspect of marketisation, one might ask about the ability of an institution to

offer its own programmes, to differentiate itself from other institutions in terms of its mode of delivery, additional services, and the availability of options such as part-time and full-time study. Some of these questions were put to the professionals who responded to this study.

Regarding the freedom to use available resources, Jongbloed asserts that this "extends to personnel inputs, financial means (budgets, financial assets) and students" (Jongbloed 2005: 118). Interestingly, the literature points to the link between the quality of students and the quality of staff. From the institution's point of view, there are good reasons to want to recruit high calibre students, particularly in the context of increasing marketisation: recruiting high calibre students may be a means of increasing the prestige and attractiveness of an institution to potential faculty members and students. After all, in the context of marketisation, performance is of paramount importance. The literature also points to the influence of neo-liberal policies with regard to terms of employment for staff; prior to the 1980s, in the countries under study, determining the qualifications and terms of employment for staff, lecturers and other academics took place within limits or agreements laid down in national regulations – for example, salary scales and collective agreements on pay rises and conditions of service. In general terms, governments have devolved decision-making relating to terms of employment to the HE sector itself. Today, there is a greater likelihood that employers (the institutions) and employees (staff, academics) negotiate pay rises and conditions of service at an individual level (Jongbloed op.cit: 118-120).

This has been accompanied in many national systems by the 'freedoms' to take financial decisions independently, to build portfolios of assets, and to be involved in a variety of fundraising activities, including taking out loans in capital markets. Further, Jongbloed asserts that governments have explicitly urged institutions to cooperate more with the private sector (Jongbloed op.cit: 121) in establishing research alliances, networks, training schemes, staff-exchange agreements, sponsored (endowed) chairs, and spin-off industries; these are areas outside of this research. The freedom to determine the prices charged to consumers is an essential element of the market system; in HE the tuition fee charged to students may be regarded as a price. It is clearly not the full price of the service, which is supported by government grants in the public institutions in this study; there is the complexity of the benefits to society at large, where technological progress and economic growth are often quoted. Nevertheless,

paying for HE is a contested issue in many nations (see, for example Mok & Lo, op.cit.), particularly where the national system has a history of supporting students to a greater degree than is the case today; these contests will not be explored in this study.

3.1.2 A free market for consumers?

On the consumer side of market conditionality, the first condition is the freedom for consumers to choose the provider of the product or service; for HE, this implies that students should be free to choose the institution which they wish to attend, provided they possess the required entry qualifications, and that funding providers have sufficient information to make judgements regarding the institutions they wish to pursue research problems.

Regarding the extent to which consumers (in this instance, students) are free to specify the type of service they would like to receive from the provider, Jongbloed points out that these 'consumers' are subject to the same restrictions as on other markets; producers or providers cannot satisfy every demand. However it is clear that many institutions offer a variety of programme choices, configurations and support packages designed to go some way towards widening options for students. But how does the market theorist justify the emphasis on student choice?

> "The rationale for increasing consumer sovereignty in this respect lies also in the belief that it will make students more discriminating educational consumers" (Jongbloed op.cit:124).

I argue that two elements are linked to this focus on the student as consumer; this freedom may be linked with the freedom of institutions to charge according to the quality of the programme and the kind of support packages they offer, which again leads us into the contested issue of fees. And secondly, consumer sovereignty is linked to the provision of sufficient information regarding both institution and the programme on offer. I do not focus on the issue of fees here, but I do intend to dwell on the issues around the provision of information.

Students or consumers require information about the relative price and quality of goods or services in order to make rational choices. This may, of course, be a theoretical position; Winston is one of those scholars who query the information which is available to students, and how that information is used (Winston 1999); others have questioned the notion of rational choice in students' selection of institution and programme.

Arguing that HE is one of those services where quality can only be experienced as the service is delivered, Jongbloed asserts:

> "This information failure may justify government regulation, with governments publishing (or facilitating the production of) consumer guides, evaluation reports, quality assessment reports, rankings, performance indicators, scorecards, and so forth" (Jongbloed op.cit:126).

As mentioned before, quality assurance policies are one of the most important devices put in place by government to allow consumers (policy makers and students) to adequately assess the 'value for money' provided by institutions of HE. But of all the types of information which the consumer/student, and other stakeholders, may be able to access, perhaps it is rankings and league tables which are the most easily 'understood', in the sense that they have an immediacy of impact. Federkeil suggests that we should see such rankings as a symbol of reputation, in that they allow a reduction in the complexity of information (Federkeil 2009:21). This immediacy and simplicity has given such rankings and league tables a place of real significance in the mind of consumers, and perhaps even (reluctantly) in the minds of academics, though many would argue that this supposed significance is undeserved. As we shall see in a later section of this chapter, the development of institutional rankings within HE has generated an immense number of academic papers, analyses, and conferences (Marginson 2007: 3). It is the global rankings which will be the focus of a later section of this chapter.

In conclusion then, we can see how the discussion above attempts to show the movement of HE away from control by the state, and mediation through the academic profession, towards a more complex interaction with the markets. This has been a deliberate policy shift in line with the move towards the ideological position of neo-liberalism. We have seen how the 'freedoms' which represent the market, may be expressed in the present delivery of today's HE systems. Two mechanisms emerge from the above which will now be examined in detail: global rankings and GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Sevices). Regarding the latter, we might usefully return to the discussion of the first supply side 'freedom' in order to make the link with the next section:

> "On the part of the private providers, there is a case for them to argue that in today's GATS-inspired marketisation climate there is no justification to deny private or foreign providers the privileges enjoyed by the national, public providers." (Jongbloed op.cit:124).

Of course, private provision of HE has not been under discussion above; nor will it be so below. But what is interesting is the potential parity which the WTO (World Trade Organisation) has brought to the market. How has GATS invigorated this climate of marketisation? This is the subject of what follows.

3.2 The World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)

Bearing in mind the theory of the pluri-scalar nature of educational governance, we now examine one such mechanism: the WTO is one of those institutions (discussed above) at the supra-national level. And of course, we have to see the WTO as part of the neo-liberal project (Verger and Bonal 2006: 14), which forms a backdrop to this study. The scholars cited in this section focus on the *realpolitik* of education rather than the important theoretical issues considered in what has gone before, and attempt to show how the global debate in education is cemented in legally binding ways. These rules seek to enable an international dimension, the scale of which is a new feature of education. It would be helpful here to point out that the literature regarding GATS is complex, and implies controversy and contested viewpoints. Knight, for example, explores the complexity of the requests made by particular nations to remove barriers to trade in the education sector (Knight 2003: 9); Shannon describes the implications of GATS as 'controversial' (Shannon 2009: 39), and Verger and Bonal look at the causes and motives for activists' reactions ('repertoires of action') against GATS (Verger and Bonal op.cit.). Knight's comment that "GATS is a new and untested agreement... we simply do not know what some of the intended and unintended consequences will be" (Knight 2003: 3) summarises the uncertainty; nevertheless, for this study, GATS demonstrates the increasing significance of the supra-national.

Robertson et al (2002) attempt to explain the mechanisms of GATS, asserting that "Globalisation is the outcome of processes that involve real actors-economic and political-with real interests" (ibid: 472). They claim that GATS (the arm of the WTO which deals specifically with the delivery of services) is worthy of attention for a number of reasons: it is less well known than other supra-national organisations, it works through binding rules rather than persuasion and leverage, and it has greater

potential than the other supranational organisations to affect education systems across their range of activities.

It might be useful here to set out some of the background which Robertson et al assert. Firstly, they point out how they perceive education to be associated with the continuing accumulation of capital in developing infrastructural support, in contributing to social order, and in providing the system as a whole with legitimacy. The increase in the commodification of education is a consequence of a more competitive global economy, as we have seen, where states have sought to seek advantages from their knowledge-driven economies. For example, in 1996 the US reported a trade surplus in education services of $8.2 billion These writers also note that the latter part of the 20th century saw a disassembling of previous governance systems and their replacement with "the forces of capital accumulation", and illustrate the significance of education as an object of desire by private bodies, in that global public spending in the sector is something in the region of $1 trillion (ibid: 474-485).

It is against this background that we now turn to the World Trade Organisation. The WTO was established in 1995, from its deep roots in the organisation which preceded it (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) with aims to promote trade liberalisation. Its remit was, and is, to increase international trade through negotiations, and to establish mechanisms to settle disputes. Importantly, the WTO "is the only international...body to establish binding rules governing trade between member countries that extend into many areas of domestic legislation". GATS, which is responsible for the development of trade in services, is one of three areas which WTO oversees, where "...decisions and policies taken at the international level (are) increasingly affecting groups and people within states" (Verger and Bonal 2006: 1). The significance of GATS to this study is that it provides the legal framework for trans-national TNHE activity; thus satisfying one important conditionality of free entry to markets within the theory of marketisation (Jongbloed op.cit.). But crucially, a number of scholars express concerns about the impact of GATS, concerns which we will now examine.

These concerns expressed by scholars are wide-ranging: they include the changing role of government and the effects on students (Knight 2002: 15), the potential for

detrimental effects on the universities of smaller and poorer nations[9], issues of quality control (van der Wende 2003: 12), the necessity for governments who have signed up to GATS to 'rescale' their decision making from a national to a global level (Robertson et al, op. cit: 492), and the spectre of cultural imperialism (ibid: 498). Robertson et al also argue that of the nations who have committed to the organisation, not all enjoy equal status and that the US, the EU, Canada and Japan all "enjoy significant input and influence over WTO decisions… and the different capacities to fix the rules of the game thus institutionalise particular economic and political interests on a new global scale" (ibid: 482-3). Altbach echoes this sentiment when he refers to global centres and peripheries, observing that in classical liberal economic theory, it is the periphery that is increasingly marginalised and the centre which increasingly becomes more dominant; he posits that this does not bode well for the universities of the less developed world (Altbach op. cit: 2).

Further concerns are raised when scholars discuss the implications of nations committing themselves to the rigours of the GATS rule book regarding HE. In essence, Robertson et al argue that the impact will be fundamental, not only for the governance of education but for individuals and societies. They contend that foreign providers would have the right of access, operation and investment, the authority to bestow degrees, the rights to seek the same level of subsidies as are offered to other internal providers and to hire their own labour (from without the host nation). They also warn that such foreign providers are in a position to undermine public delivery of education services. Interestingly, they conclude that the pressures arising from GATS push institutions "to behave more like commercial organisations and to have profit making…as their primary objective" (Robertson et al, op.cit: 488). Here, then, is yet another vector which is driving HE towards marketisation and commercialisation: "…the conditions are being created for dis-embedding education from its fixed …location as a nationally regulated, re-distributional and legitimatory de-commodified public good, forcing it into motion and into the global market place…"(ibid: 488).

---

[9] "The fear is also that transnational education will be detrimental to smaller nations and languages. It will exacerbate dramatic inequalities among the world's universities, with a dominant role of the world-class universities in Western industrialized countries. Smaller and poorer countries will have little autonomy or competitive potential in the globalized world (Altbach: 2001:4)

Perhaps, then, it is not surprising that there appears to be considerable reluctance to commit education to the schedule of liberalisation commitments.

"...the WTO - unlike the EU, The World Bank, and the OECD - has no social agenda" (ibid: 491). Robertson et al express concern that this lack of a social agenda will increasingly pose a dilemma for nation states who wish to use their education policies for the purposes of social cohesion or as a means to distribute equality of opportunity, and warn that in a global market place, acquiring a high-quality education could become the reserve of those whose pockets are deep enough. This is a reflection of the fact that the WTO has relied for its legitimacy on the discourse of neo-liberalism and the notion of 'trickle-down' (ibid: 491-2), ignoring wider social and political agendas.

It is not surprising, given the nature of the perceptions reported above, that there has been slow progress in multilateral trade negotiations. Nevertheless, as trade in HE continues to expand, many countries are signing regional or bilateral trade agreements that have included the education sector (ibid: 8). Bashir reports on the nature of these Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and the numbers of nations engaged in such activity:

> "Even those governments which actively encourage foreign participation in HE have not made commitments in mode 3 (commercial presence), in order to give themselves greater freedom to negotiate with individual providers of their choice without an obligation to extend the same terms to other providers. Second, even among those countries which have made commitments, while very few impose hurdles on the movement of students abroad, many, including industrialized countries, wish to restrict access to foreign providers operating within their boundaries (Bashir 2007: 60)."

Despite the slow progress which GATS appears to have made in this decade, I nevertheless argue that we might still see GATS as a form of 'creeping supra-nationalism', in that such 'liberalisation' appears to be firmly on the international agenda, evidenced by the rash of bi-lateral FTAs. I further argue that GATS contributes to the enhanced 'international dimension of HE' that I discuss earlier in Chapter 2. We now move onto another supra-national mechanism, which has also emerged during this century, which is also pushing HE in the direction of the market. Though global league tables are not a function of a supra-national government ideology, as with the WTO, but have emerged almost by surprise from the world's publishing houses, they are nevertheless no less powerful a force in shaping opinion, and possibly, in shaping governance practices.

3.3 League Tables and Benchmarking

University league tables or rankings first appeared in the *US News and World Report* in the 1981 "in order to meet a perceived market need for more transparent, comparative data about educational institutions" (Usher & Massimo 2006: 3). Since that time, rankings have emerged in many countries, and have been produced by newspapers and magazines, by ministries of education, and by universities themselves (Marginson 2007: 2); indeed, as interest in rankings has grown, an established body of experts has emerged. The International Ranking Expert Group (IREG) first convened in 2004, and has become the most representative global forum for presentation and analysis of college ranking (Sadlak, Merisotis, and Liu 2008: 198)[10]. But the fact that these rankings did not spring from HE institutions in the first instance, but from those who wished to serve the needs of the market, or the needs of consumers, resonates with much of what has gone before in the literature review of this study, in particular the growing marketisation of HE. And with the emergence of two institutional ranking projects which compare institutions on a global basis, one could argue that we are witnessing an increasingly global dimension to this market.

3.3.1 League Tables and Neo-liberalism

One point of interest about the emergence of league tables is their tacit acceptance by governments who have embraced the neo-liberal project: as demonstrated earlier, league tables are one of the mechanisms through which information, one of the oxygens of the market, can be fed. And of course, it is not only the university sector which now operates in the league table environment, but many social service providers. Turner

---

[10] The papers presented at the IREG-3 at Shanghai Jiao Tong University in October 2007 are representative of three distinct groupings: 1. Papers that reflect on international rankings. 2. Papers that present new developments and recent experiences with national rankings. 3. Papers that contribute to the enhancement of ranking by analyzing typology or the possibilities for multi-dimensional rankings (Sadlak, Merisotis and Liu 2008: 198)

points out how these rankings are both allowed and used by government to engage public interest and to exert pressure on institutions to perform more efficiently:

> "Although the league tables themselves have no official status, the notion that a wider public should be able to make judgements about the relative merits of institutions on the basis of published information does. The official notion, upheld publicly, is that such open comparison will act as a spur to those institutions that fall below standards achieved within the sector. In a word, the purpose is the benchmarking of institutions, so that a wider public can assess where there are inefficiencies within the system, and so that managers can use the information within institutions to improve their performance." (Turner 2005: 355)

The engagement of the public into the debate about the quality of institutions has had profound effects. Informal consensus on the relative quality of HE institutions has always existed at the level of the ministry, the senior management team, and those who work in the sector, but the published league table serves to fuse these perceptions of quality onto an international student market (Merisotis & Sadlak 2005: 99). Thus the result of formalizing what was an informal consensus has been dramatic. Hazelkorn posits a 'gladiatorial obsession' with the upper echelon of the ranks, which emerges from the data collected in this study:

> "Today, despite the fact there are over 17,000 HEIs worldwide, there is a near gladiatorial obsession with the 'top' 100 universities as evidenced by increasing coverage in the popular press and statements by politicians, policy-makers and other opinion formers." (Hazelkorn 2008)

League tables are seen as a form of benchmarking, where performance in one institution is compared to performance in another. Turner posits that benchmarking is a perfectly legitimate practice, and should arguably be undertaken on a regular basis in universities, as one way of ensuring that institutions do not become inefficient (Turner 2005: 335). Zairi has described the practice of benchmarking as "an enabler for achieving and maintaining high levels of competitiveness" and "a measure of business performance against the best of the best through a continuous effort of constantly reviewing processes, practices and methods" (Zairi 1998: 35). Some scholars have postulated that, to improve the quality of higher education, some nations ought to 'introduce annual ranking of universities and colleges, based on a number of criteria'; they hold that rankings, if used appropriately, can be valuable in promoting healthy competition among institutions and fostering informed discussion in support of higher education. (Sadlak, Merisotis, and Liu 2008: 196-198). League tables should be seen as a benchmarking practice, in which competitiveness between, and efficiency within, institutions is promoted, but many have suggested that this approach to benchmarking is excessively simplistic; these ideas are explored in the followings sections.

3.3.2 How League Tables are constructed

Much has been written to help us to understand how these devices work (see, for example, Jobbins 2005, Liu & Liu 2005, Usher & Massimo 2006, Marginson 2007). In this section, I dwell on the two global ranks, the Shanghai Jiao Tong Da Xue's Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU), and the Times Higher Education Supplement's (THES) World University Rankings. I chose these for three reasons: firstly because they are widely consulted by the informants from academia in this research; secondly because my own research suggests they are often referred to by Asian students; and finally because these two rankings demonstrate differences in design, differences which point to the problems in their usage. The former (ARWU) appeared in 2003, the latter (THES) a year later. Both are deemed to be influential, though they are constructed in quite different ways. What they share is the comparison of institutions based on a range of indicators, which are then weighted by the respective authors (Usher & Massimo 2006: 8, 14).

Shanghai Jiao Tong Da Xue Institute of Higher Education's ARWU is perhaps unusual in that it comes out of the HE sector; it is in fact a measure of scientific competencies, garnered from official data produced not by universities and ministries of education, but from publications outputs. Its authors attempt to identify measures of clear international standing (Liu & Liu 2005: 201) and argue that these are the only measures which are sufficiently reliable to enable comparison in a rank; they have rejected subjective indicators (Marginson 2007: 5). 90% of the rank is based on research criteria, and the remaining 10% is based on learning outputs. Of the research weighting, 20% is derived from biblio-metric citations in various publishing indices, such as the Science Citation Index (SCI) and the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). International research awards - specifically the number of alumni who have won Nobel prizes or Field Medals - constitutes 30% of the final weighting (Usher & Massimo 2006: 28). It might be said that the ARWU is a 'true' league table in that it is 'based on objective measures of various characteristics' (Bromley 2002: 37)

By contrast, the authors of the THES are outside academia, as with most of the league table publishers. Their ranking uses five indicators to reflect strength in teaching, research, and international reputation: namely, peer reviews, international faculty,

international students, staff/student ratios and citations (see Table 2, below). A further contrast to the ARWU is the considerable weighting given to the reputation of an institution: 50% of the final weighting of the THES table is in fact 'peer review and reputation'[11]. The ARWU uses no such indicators, which are clearly indirect or subjective measures of quality rather than the direct measures as described above. Other indicators include the faculty-to-student ratio, which accounts for 20 percent of the total, and international faculty and international students, each of which make up 5 percent of the total. The former represents a simple and robust proxy for an institution's commitment to teaching, and the latter represents a further proxy for a university's international orientation. A further 20 percent of the total score accounts for a ranking of research impact, calculated by measuring citations per faculty member (Jobbins 2005: 141).

---

[11]The first element in the score for each institution is based on peer review, produced by QS, a London-based company best known for its worldwide activities in MBA and graduate recruitment. This 'electoral college' emerged from a sample based on bought-in lists of academics. The company then seeks other respondents to balance nominations in academic discipline and location, an attempt to fill the identified disciplinary and regional gaps. The THES total sample comprises active academics – there is no dilution of academic focus through the inclusion of, for example, administrators, and officials. This 'electoral college' then had to name the top institutions in the areas and subjects on which they felt able to make an informed judgement (Jobbins 2005: 143).

Table 2: 2007 THES Criteria

Criteria	Indicator	Brief Description	Weight
Research Quality	Peer Review	Composite score drawn from peer review (which is divided into five subject areas). 3,703 responses.	40%
	Citations per Faculty	Score based on research performance factored against the size of the research body	20%
Graduate Employability	Recruiter Review	Score based on responses to recruiter survey. 738 responses	10%
International Outlook	International Faculty	Score based on proportion of international faculty	5%
	International Students	Score based on proportion of international students	5%
Teaching Quality	Student Faculty	Score based on student/faculty ratio	20%

Source: Jobbins 2005

3.2.3 The Debate: Opinion about League Tables

The development of these institutional rankings has generated an immense number of academic papers, analyses, and conferences (for example, see Hazelkorn, op.cit: 195, and more recently, Kehm and Stensaker [12]); this is at least partly because there is a sense that all is not well with these systems (Marginson 2007: 3). Other writers take a more nuanced view; there is an acceptance of stake-holders' demands for types of information that rankings can provide. The conversation has shifted to focus on how the methods behind rankings can be as clear and reliable as possible and to go beyond reflecting research-based institutional performance towards multi-dimensional models (see, for example, Sadlak, Merisotis, and Liu 2008). Dill argues that 'academic prestige', as represented by league tables, has come to represent academic quality, and is bringing about an 'academic arms race' which is distorting the costs of HE (Dill 2009).

But returning to the critiques, the central disquiet is that these mechanisms are controlled not by universities, but by those who choose to 'write' the rankings. Usher and Massimo suggest that rankings have caused 'institutional unease' (Usher & Massimo 2006: 3); Marginson goes somewhat further in his description when he suggests they can be 'capricious and destructive' (Marginson 2007:2). Other writers point to the dynamic nature of these devices, reminding us that such rankings are multiplying and are developing methodologically, that they are anything but static (Merisotis & Sadlak 2005, Federkeil 2009). What is commonly held, however, is that there is little agreement among the authors of individual ranks as to what indicates quality:

> "The world's main ranking systems bear little if any relationship to one another, using very different indicators and weightings to arrive at a measure of quality" (Usher & Massimo 2006:3).

Further, some writers argue that the indicators used in league tables generally fail to meet high levels of validity and reliability. A good deal of the literature on league

---

[12] These authors suggest that we can interpret league tables in five ways: as market regulators, as a part of globalisation, as evidence of the rise in the Audit society, as prompts towards Institutional identity creation and as a symptom of KE (Kehm and Stensaker 2009)

tables, and critiques of league tables, is devoted to the poor quality of the statistics used (Bowden 2000, Turner 2005, Yorke 1997). Marginson encourages his readers to

> "... raise questions about the validity and utility of both the process of comparison and data used in that process" (Marginson 2007: 3).

Regarding validity, it might be appropriate to cite an example of the sort of issue which is raised in this context, though I must caution the reader that the following statement is made by the editor of the ARWU main rival, the Times Higher. Nevertheless, O'Leary's statement raises an issue much referred to in the literature:

> "Nobel prizes and Fields medals account for almost a third of the points in the list of top universities compiled this year by Shanghai Jiao Tong University.
> But, why count only these prizes? And why credit the universities where prizewinners studied, some at the turn of the century before last? Why, indeed, credit universities where winners carried out their research, often at least 20 years previously, rather than the institution that now benefits from their presence?"(O'Leary, 2004, quoted in Jobbins, 2004: 146)

In the context of China, Nian Cai Liu and Li Liu also register their concerns regarding the questionable reliability of some rankings and data, with the heavy use of country-specific indicators, and over instances of misinterpretation of ranking results by the public (Liu & Liu 2005: 201). But it is this latter point relating to misinterpretation and usage by the public that is seized upon by many writers, including Marginson.

> "The chief problem with the Jiao Tong data lies not in their validity but their use. For the most part they are understood around the world not as a ranking of university research performance but as a holistic ranking of the universities concerned and a marker of reputation in the emerging global university market. Harvard becomes understood not as number one research site according to Shanghai Jiao Tong University but as number one *university*. This is despite the explicit urging of the Jiao Tong group *not* to interpret the data as holistic rankings; and despite the fact that those data favour certain kinds of institution and disadvantage others...In contrast with Shanghai Jiao Tong the explicit aim of the THES is to produce a summative, holistic ranking."(Marginson 2007: 6, 7)

Though it is not my intention here only to select criticism of the ARWU, as one might suspect from the three paragraphs above, Liu and Liu also focus on this league table regarding the bias which results from its design; there is a clear bias towards awards, the sciences, and use of English (Liu & Liu 2005: 201). Marginson also claims that the Jiao Tong design favours universities "large and comprehensive enough to amass strong research performance over a broad range of fields while carrying few research inactive staff" (Marginson 2007: 6). Usher and Massimo also posit that it is the large university, and "those with good inputs", which are likely to score highly across the tables (Usher & Massimo 2006: 35).

In the interest of balance, I look now at the broadsides aimed at the methodology of the THES rank, where criticism is equally strong. The heavy reliance on peer review is one area rich in methodological query; writers have questions about who is asked to respond to the questionnaires, what they are responding to, how many choose to reply, and the skew resulting from the responses received:

> "It is not specified who is surveyed or what questions are asked. The survey gathers a response of just 1 per cent from 200,000 e-mails sent worldwide and not all responses are valid and can be used. The responses that do come in tend to be from (certain) nations..." (Marginson 2007: 7).

One of the perceived problems with the THES is the volatility of the rankings year on year. Marginson puts this down, at least partly, to the fact that it is not reputation of the institution but the individual respondents who change from one survey to the next. Further, he suggests that international student numbers are not a measure of quality, and the lesser role of research in the table suggests that the marketing effort may be of more influence in the rank than the university's researchers (Marginson 2007: 8). These criticisms may be true, but they do not take away from the widespread use of the mechanism, and the possible power it has to influence an increasingly marketised sector. Hazelkorn is one of those writers who focus on the impact of rankings on institutional behaviour and decision making; this study should be seen in that category of the literature, that is, of commenting on the consequences of league tables on institutional activity:

> "... attention has begun to focus on the questions of impact and influence (asserted by league tables): on higher education, higher education institutions, policymaking, stakeholders, and public opinion." (Hazelkorn 2007: 196)

Interestingly, a majority of respondents in her 2007 study reported they had developed formal internal mechanisms for reviewing their rank, taking strategic, operational, management and/or academic decisions as a result of these reviews (ibid: 197-8).

I borrow one further point, this time from Kehm and Stensaker, regarding league tables, before concluding this section. The point in question relates to the notion of reputation as part of the accountability system of universities. These authors point out that accountability is a particular problem for HE in that its 'products' and services are intangible. Though reputation may be used for accountability purposes, it (reputation) may actually be a poor indicator of quality (Kehm & Stensaker 2009: xviii).

3. 4 Conclusion and Comment

In the chapter above, I have suggested the elements which are necessary for markets to exist. We have seen how HE has moved from a sector which was largely controlled by the state to one which now has a more complex interaction with the markets, and how this movement is associated with neo-liberalism. The GATS mechanism has been examined in the context of that philosophy. The concerns which scholars express regarding GATS echo the anxieties which have arisen in the debates surrounding globalisation: issues around social justice, the emasculation of the nation state, cultural imperialism, the incentives for HE to behave more like commercial organisations and the pressures for changes in governance. I argue that the importance of GATS in this research is that it acts as an exemplar of an increasing number of global or regional governance mechanisms, and as a backdrop to an increasingly marketised sector, though it will not have the visibility of the second mechanism discussed: the mechanism of the global rank.

Global rankings will be much more visible in this study. It seems likely that the influence of league tables will increase; if we assume that the trend for governments to contribute less to HE will continue, then those costs will be passed on to individuals. In these circumstances, the demand for comparative information will strengthen. The device apparently fits the purposes of many governments as the neo-liberal project has deepened; indeed, not only are there many instances of governments developing their own league tables to measure other areas of social provision, such as in secondary education and health, but we are also seeing interest from supra-national organisations such as the EU to produce *regional* league tables.

What is particularly interesting is how so many writers in this area perceive these ranking systems to have great power. In my own pilot interviews for this research, I was surprised how many informants at managerial level referred to these devices without prompting; this fact certainly shaped my research questions. Because these devices have attracted so much public attention, they have necessarily attracted the attention of institutional management; proponents of neo-liberalism would perhaps celebrate this triumph of the market!

Some commentators suggest that the power of the rank lies in their shaping of institutional mission, practice and purpose (Marginson 2007: 2). As previously stated, these global ranks are often interpreted by the public as holistic measures even where no such intention existed; thus, "Rankings function as a meta-performance indicator" (Marginson 2007: 2). Institutions are then compelled to react to this situation. Since in the perceived view of the ARWU and the THES, quality rests on research, Nobel prizes, reputation, and international students, then it is these metrics that institutions themselves must address most urgently, even if their missions include other concerns such as teaching or relations with the local community or helping to solve local, regional and global problems. As institutions are harried into a global system, are league tables redefining HE?

From her research of institutions across the globe, Hazelkorn asserts that institutional leaders take rankings seriously, embedding them within their strategic planning processes at all levels of the organization. She found that HEIs use ranking metrics to guide their own goals. One of her respondents stated: '*the improvement of the results has become a target in the contract between presidency and departments*', while another confirmed they have '*developed a set of internal research output indicators...we do internal benchmarking*'. Some institutions had used rankings as a tool to influence not just organizational change but institutional priorities (Hazelkorn 2008: 196).

It is instructive to note a sentence from an information booklet published by the Office of International Affairs (OIA) of a case study institution of this study, because it links five concepts which will be developed during the study; the significance of benchmarks, the efforts to internationalise the institution by its senior managers, the role of Taiwanese government policy, the controversy surrounding international league tables, and the determination to continue the policy despite the controversy:

> "As (the institution) is striving to advance its placement on the prestigious though somewhat controversial lists of the world's top 100 universities, the Office of International Affairs role becomes even more instrumental as both (the institution) and MoE demand the establishment of benchmarks to expedite the goals of internationalisation." (OIA 2007: 3)

Having laid out the conceptual and theoretical frameworks for the study in this chapter and in Chapter 2, I now move onto an explanation of the meta-theoretical position and a description of the empirical part of the study.

Chapter 4. Research Methodology and Study Design

This chapter explains the meta-theoretical positions, the research design and the methodology which underpin the empirical research to be reported in Chapters 5 to 9. It is organised into three sections. The first section presents the philosophical positions taken. The second section presents the research questions and the research design, and is where I consider the methods employed in collecting the data. The final section charts the progress of the research and reflects upon the data collection and analysis.

4.1 The Philosophical Approaches

The meta-theoretical position I embrace for this research is 'critical realism'. I acknowledge the central ontological and epistemological issues; one has to ask what the nature of reality is, and how we gain knowledge about that reality (Danermark et al., 2002: 2). Proponents of realism suggest that this position provides an explicit and coherent basis from which to investigate the social world. It is regarded as the principal post-positivist perspective, steering "a path between empiricist and constructivist accounts of explanation" (Pawson 2006: 17). In brief, the advantages of a critical realist stance are that it provides

> "...a basis for causal explanation of social phenomena, a coherent account of modes of inference and theorizing appropriate to social investigation...and a way of handling the complex and contested relationship between intentional, decision-making, human agents and the conditioning effects of social structures" (Ballantyne 2009: 20).

Critical realism has at its centre the ontological assumption that social phenomena, in the same way as objects in the physical world, exist outside our knowledge of them. Thus Bhaskar, one of the core figures in critical realism, posits that scientific investigation is unintelligible unless we assume a world independent of our beliefs about it (Bhaskar 2009).

One of the core features of critical realism is the distinction made between 'intransitive' and 'transitive' dimensions of knowledge (ibid). Real physical and social phenomena are referred to as the 'intransitive' dimension of knowledge while the concepts, theories and resources through which we experience and know the world form a 'transitive' dimension. We only know the natural or the social worlds through 'transitive' aspects

such as language, concepts, theory and discourse; but these transitive aspects can change without there necessarily being a change in the intransitive objects to which they refer (Bhaskar 1978, 1989: 69; Sayer 2000: 10).

A second core feature of critical realism is that reality is conceived of having ontological depth; in critical realist terms, reality is differentiated, structured and stratified:

> "The empirical domain consists of what we experience, directly or indirectly. It is separated from the actual domain where events happen whether we experience them or not. What happens in the world is not the same as that which is observed. But this domain is in its turn separated from the real domain. In this domain there is also that which can produce events in the world, that which metaphorically can be called mechanisms (Danermark et al., 2002: 20)"

For the critical realist, then, empirical work involves investigating "actual and possible relationships between what we experience, what actually happens and the underlying mechanisms that produce events in the world" (Ballantyne 2009: 20). In this study, the mechanisms under study, as outlined in the previous chapter, are the supra-national mechanisms such as global league tables; the investigation centres on their effects "in the world", in this instance, in the world of HE, or more specifically, in the governance of HE.

Since the term 'mechanism' has been used above, it is pertinent here to review the term within the theorem generally associated with realists, and which has been touched upon in the Introduction to this thesis.

> "Explanations focus on interesting, puzzling, socially significant outcome patterns (O). Explanation takes the form of positing some underlying mechanism (M) that generates the outcome, which will consist of propositions about how structural resources and agents reasoning have constituted the regularity. The workings of such mechanisms are always contingent and conditional, and hypotheses will also be constructed in respect of which local, institutional and historical contexts (C) are conducive to the action of the mechanism (Pawson 2000: 296-298).

This theorem can be expressed in the equation O = f (M.C), where outcomes (O) are a function of mechanisms (M) activated in particular contexts (C) (Ballantyne 2009: 30, Pawson 2000: 23). Thus Pawson and others argue that it is not sufficient for a hypothesis to postulate the underlying mechanism giving rise to empirical outcomes; it must describe the contextual conditions that may have been conducive to their formation. (ibid: 297). In this study, the outcomes are considered as governance changes; the perceived need for a description and analysis of the contextual conditions justify the case study approach, where the political, economic, social and technological developments at chosen locations are carefully examined. The significance of context

lies in the notion that in different contexts the same mechanism may produce different outcomes, and ties in with the 'open system' claim of realists that social systems are the products of many components and forces; with open systems, there is always a conjunctive multiplicity of causality (Bhaskar 2009).

Bhaskar is clear regarding the approach a researcher needs to take should one be involved in a problem where there is a multiplicity of influences in an open systemic environment (ibid). There should, he suggests, be six steps in the analysis. The first step is the resolution or identification of the components of the problem. These components should then be re-described or defined. There should then follow a process of retrodiction, a reasoning back from a complex situation to find the triggers for the outcomes, followed by an elimination of the factors which do not appear to be triggers, and finally an identification of the triggers which are clearly active.

The multiplicity of causality (above) also provides a rationale and justification for the case study approach adopted in this project, in that only the case study can attempt to show the laminate of contextual levels needed in my research. I need to be aware of the psychological, the psycho-social, the socio-economic and the social-cultural, in order to answer the questions I pose. This laminate of contexts is real, it is in the world, and it is not merely a mental construct.

But returning to ontology, for Bhaskar an important part of the argument for a realist social ontology turns on the causal powers of social phenomena:

> "... science employs two criteria for the ascription of reality to a posited object: a perceptual one and a causal one. The latter turns on the capacity of the entity whose existence is in doubt to bring about changes in material things. It follows from this that if intentional action is a necessary condition for certain determinate states of the physical world, then the properties and powers that persons possess in virtue of which intentionality is correctly attributed to them are real. Similarly if it can be shown that but for society certain physical actions would not be performed then employing the causal criterion we are justified in asserting that it is real (Bhaskar 1989:69)."

Secondly, realists reflect on the structured nature of social reality: "A tribesman implies a tribe, the cashing of a cheque a banking system" (Bhaskar, 1978). Social predicates such as these refer to particular kinds of internally defined relational properties that constitute the structured nature of social reality (Ballantyne 2009: 30); thus the context of social activity is densely structured and consists of internally related social phenomena (Lawson, 1999: 2). It is important to note that structures are more than simply the observable context or setting for human agency; they "constitute the deep

dimension of social reality, where those mechanisms are located which ultimately generate the events in … society" (Danermark et al., 2002:34).

The third distinctive feature of the critical realist ontology is stratification. Reality, including both natural and social phenomena consists of different layers or strata which are hierarchically organized and irreducible. If we take these last two ontological themes in the context of this study, we might think about the deeply structured and hierarchical nature of HE. Clearly HE has vastly complex social structures; there are networks, for example, at international, national, and institutional levels. If we consider the social dimensions of global league tables we also find complexity and hierarchy. League tables provide communication about certain standards which reinforce the patterns of those who have already achieved success; these discipline-based epistemological elites decide what is published, and what is published is the basis of the research metric in the league tables. There are circularities based on these epistemological elites: citations, social networks, peer review and reputation. All these are part of the circularities within these small groups of actors; the only difference, as Enders points out (Enders 2009), between peer review and citation is the size of the group. One can argue, then, that rankings simply take the standards of the academic world and use them for different purposes, and that this is hegemonic in that a narrow view takes dominance. Few would argue that these standards of the academic world are western, and emerge largely from English speaking, older institutions, and contribute to the highly stratified nature of HE.

Returning to meta-theory, from the multiplicity of causes comes the notion of emergence, another thread in the realist cloth. Emergence can be defined as "...situations in which the conjuncture of two or more features or aspects give rise to new phenomena…irreducible to their own components" (Sayer 2000: 12). In this study I will be investigating a number of managerial devices in HE, and in that there is nothing new. But in the manner in which I look at these devices, in the manner in which I look for convergence, in the search for reasons behind governance change, I may discover a new element.

I have also found other theoretical positions useful. For the 'bigger picture' at state/national and global levels, critical theory offers valuable analytic insights into the position of mechanisms in HE that support elitism and the status quo. Critical theory

concerns itself with problematising accepted power structures of power, and countering situations where people have become acculturated to accept domination and subordination, particularly in a media-saturated Western culture; it is about unearthing changing power relationships with a view to offering a voice to 'the unheard', and challenging inequalities (Crotty, 1998). Privileged groups often have an interest in supporting the status quo to protect their advantage, and discourses can serve as a form of regulation and domination (Kincheloe and McClaren 2002).

This study is also informed by Bourdieu's reflections on the sociology of human activities in general and on HE in particular. Bourdieu uses the notion of 'fields' to denote areas of professional life or activity, and sees these fields as sites of struggle between newcomers and 'dominant agents' or established elites (Bourdieu 1993:72). This struggle is seen as a personal struggle 'to augment one's social being' (Lucas quotes Bourdieu, Lucas 2006: 56), and also as an inter-institutional struggle (Lucas: 2006: 62). Bourdieu also uses the concept of 'illusio' to analyse the situation where professionals in a field become so involved that they (we) "are possessed by the game", they take it seriously, because it is a form of social expression and a means of legitimising the game (ibid: 63). He makes the assumption that academic work by academics "is indissociably (linked) with potential recognition by the agent's competitor-peers" (Bourdieu: 1984: 262). I view these analytical tools as very useful in a study which is socially and contextually bound in the lives of academics and in their situation within a wider field of global HE.

Power and knowledge circulate through this study; one could ask, for example, where the power of the league table is vested. Michael Foucault, one of the writers in this broad tradition of critique above, argues that knowledge is only acquired within a prior discourse, and it is the social discourse, rather than the beliefs of individuals, which are crucial to Foucault's interpretations (Gillam 2005: 29). He views knowledge as always working in the interests of particular groups, not as dispassionate and objective, and power as a "network or net of relations circulating through society" (Mills 2003: 79, citing Foucault). That the world can only be known under certain descriptions, in terms of certain discourses, is also a theme of critical realists.

In summing up this section, we might look at the aim of this project and how it fits with the realist ideas of explanation. This is a study about university governance at faculty

level: the hypothesis is that if the mechanisms (M) are powerful enough, then the differences in context (C) will be overwhelmed, resulting in converging outcomes (O). And Sayer posits that

> "Explanation depends on identifying causal mechanisms and how they work, and discovering how they have been activated and under what conditions (Sayer, 1992:87)."

Having looked above at some of the background philosophical issues important to this study, I now turn to the details of how the empirical part of the study was designed.

4.2 Research Design

4.2.1 Seeking sensible design solutions

The research questions grew from my interest in the globalisation process in East Asia, and I suggest that HE might be seen as an instance of this process. The focus is on the changes in governance at universities which might illuminate the power of globalising forces. Thus the research questions were:

- Can we observe the process of globalisation in East Asia, and can we perceive Higher Education as an instance or mechanism of globalisation?
- Is there a 'new' supra-national competitive environment which promotes globalisation in Higher Education?
- Does this 'new' supra-national environment lead to an imperative for universities to build/manage their reputations?
- Can we observe a convergence of governance in Higher Education which results from this 'new' supra-national environment?

Thus, the study is an attempt to investigate whether globalisation drives convergence in governance in world wide universities. I expected to find that mechanisms ('M', see page 64) such as global league tables are changing governance in universities at the operational level ('O'), and that the motives behind these changes were/are common. To test these hypotheses, an empirical investigation was carried out; this section describes how that investigation was designed.

As argued before, convergence is a topic which can only be successfully tested empirically, needing outcomes from real-life contexts (Bennet 1992), rather than a topic which can be confirmed or refuted by theoretical discussion. Regarding the research design, the paramount question revolved around the most appropriate methods to tackle the research questions above, and clearly a comparative study was needed for an enquiry of this sort. I chose the comparative method in this study because this method has the capacity to attribute causality (see, for example, de Vaus 2001: 35-54); this was important in this study, because I was interested in looking for causal links between, for

example, league tables and reputation management. The literature suggests that much depends upon 'matching' of respondent groups with regard to 'relevant characteristics' (ibid: 44); I discuss the respondent group later. Hantrais and Mangen argue that for a study to be cross-national and comparative, individuals or teams should set out to study particular issues or phenomena in two or more countries with the express intention of comparing their manifestations in different socio-cultural settings, using the same research instrument (Hantrais and Mangen, 1996:1) This study fulfils those conditions in that the primary research tool is an interview schedule (the design of which is discussed later) which is used to gather data in three nation states and a Special Administrative Region (HKSAR). There may be a question as to how successful the same research instrument can be across cultural divides; my research instrument made no concession to the cultural setting in which it would operate.

Returning to the research design: three East Asian and one European polity were chosen. I decided to study three polities in the greater China, namely the People's Republic, Hong Kong, and Taiwan: these provided great contrasts in political configuration and size, whilst sharing the same culture. And there was the practical consideration that they were relatively close and well connected, which would assist in the logistical factors of time and resources. I then chose the UK, which had a long tradition in university development, as a reference point, a base line, from which I might attempt to analyse the developments elsewhere.

Within each of these polities, a case study university was selected; these choices are described in the latter section of this chapter. I considered the case study approach the most appropriate research method firstly because such an approach fits in with the meta-theoretical basis, and secondly, as Yin posits, it is an enquiry method investigating a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context, where the boundaries between the context and the phenomenon are not evident (Yin 1984:23). Because the case study requires contextual analysis, I argue that it has the potential to allow insights into complex issues such as globalisation and convergence. I chose four case studies as a compromise; fewer offered the potential for more detailed analysis, more would have provided wider coverage. The cases chosen were judged to provide sufficient similarities and contrasts to allow a meaningful comparison.

Having established the case study as central to the research design, I then needed to

select a method to collect the data. In fact, there were two data sets to be collected: one set pertaining to the context for each study, the other pertaining to my perception of a recently enhanced competition-environment in HE, the imperative to build reputation, and the notion that governance was converging, notions which emerge from the literature and from my own questioning.

For the first data set, relating to the context, I judged that a literature review and documentary analysis was the most appropriate method to collect data; this data would need to fit into a 'context template'. This template had to be sufficiently flexible to allow for a wide variance of, for example, time scales and availability of materials: for mainland China, for instance, I expected to find a long time period when higher learning developed; for Taiwan, I expected a much shorter time scale. Thus, I chose to seek answers to these questions; the questions themselves constituted the case study template, and for some of the questions there is a clear link to the literatures of Chapters 2 and 3:

- What time periods might represent the stages in the development of HE?
- What are the political, economic, social and technological factors driving these HE systems within these time frames?
- How have these factors shaped the present situation in these HE systems?
- How has governance evolved during these time periods?
- What are the current forces which are shaping HE, and is the 'competition state' significant?
- What are the current drivers of governance change?

The second set of data, referring to my perception of a recently enhanced competition-environment in HE, the imperative to build reputation in universities, and the notion that governance was converging as a response, required primary data. I then faced the issue, regarding governance convergence, of what I should or could compare; clearly I could not compare everything. I had to choose certain levels of administration and purpose; my scoping study, intensive reading around the subject, and perhaps common sense, suggested that the organisation of the 'core business' of research and teaching might be fruitful areas to compare, and related to this, changes in the styles of management. I was also fascinated by the international dimension, and the possibility that reputation was associated with this. From these beginnings I constructed a data template,

described below.

I decided to organise my empirical queries into two sections, which reflected the fact that I was interested in both the context and the effects in context. The first section would consider the contexts which have emerged from the literature: a context of competition, a context of league tables, and a context of organisational change. The intention of the first query was to examine the suggestion emerging from the literature that the nation state is increasingly a site of competition with other states; would this suggestion be recognised at the case study institution? The second and third queries sought to examine whether there was any evidence at the case study institutions that there was awareness of or influence from the league tables in general and global league tables in particular, and whether re-organisation or governance change was proceeding, and whether such changes, if they existed, might be related to the aforementioned competition and league tables. The second section comprises of five queries, which seek data relating to styles of management, strategies for reputation building, the research culture of the institution, the process of internationalisation, and the teaching culture at the case study institutions.

The nature of the queries was such that they could not be answered using a quantitative method, such as a survey; I was seeking detailed description (of policy evolution, of changes in learning patterns, of developing practice) and deep reflection/explanation (of reasons for choice of policy or practice, of problems which may emerge, of local difficulties) which required an understanding of the motives behind the operational changes at the case study universities. It seemed that the most effective way to achieve this was through a qualitative study. In order to explore the direction of governance change, I could have organised a longitudinal or an ethnographic study, or attempted to interview those on the ground who were intimately involved with governance. I considered the latter as the optimum method in this situation; if I was able to get access to such people, I would be able to seek not only description of changes, but also explanations for the motives behind such changes. A longer term longitudinal study, considered essential to gauge convergence, might well have provided a clearer picture of the nature of change, but I judged that interviewing might enable a 'short-cut' to the same results, and have the additional advantage of getting much closer to the causes of change and the local/contextual parameters of change. All of this depended on access to

the 'right' people', that is, people who might be able to reflect on the current pressures in HE and the consequences of those pressures.

The need for a qualitative approach was also supported by the decision to collect the data from a relatively small number of respondents, who would enable the required depth, in an interview situation. The qualitative approach sees the world as socially constructed, and recognises the subjective viewpoints of interviewer and interviewee; it is able to offer the promise of deep understanding of social reality (Warren 2004: 524). What makes the approach chosen for this research fit for purpose are the recurrent characteristics in qualitative research, reproduced below from Miles and Huberman (1994: 10), each phrase of which echoes the intentions here:

- "Qualitative research is conducted through an intense and/or prolonged contact with a ... life situation. These situations are typically ... normal, reflective of the everyday life of individuals, groups...
- The researcher's role is to gain a 'holistic' overview of the context under study...
- The researcher attempts to capture data on the perceptions of local actors 'from the inside', through a process of deep attentiveness, [and] empathetic understanding..."

Having established that interviews would be the primary research tool, I then needed to decide who to put my questions to. During the scoping study stage of the research, I had had the good fortune to interview the President of a Taiwanese university, a Vice Chancellor of a UK university, a number of deans (in Hong Kong, PRC and Taiwan), and lecturers and administrators in all the nations which were to be part of the study: of course, all were most useful experiences. But it became apparent to me that the position of dean of faculty/college offered the most with regard to the answers I was seeking, because this position, though different in detail at each case study institution, involved both strategic knowledge and operational experience. Added to this, my key respondents in the scoping part of the study had considerable international experience; to some extent they had an intuitively comparative analytical approach when commenting on the local and the national, which was intrinsically useful to this project. Thus the nature of the respondent sample was purposive. Taking note of the literature

relating to comparative studies, which suggests that much depends upon 'matching' of respondent groups with regard to their 'relevant characteristics' (de Vaus 2001: 35-54), it seemed appropriate to target my queries towards deans of faculty/college at all of the case study institutions.

The scale of the study only allowed one faculty to be targeted, and I chose the faculty with which I had a little familiarity, Social Sciences; the scoping study had already revealed that Social Sciences were a feature of the university life in all the case study institutions, a fact which allowed me to pursue this feature of the research design. However, I was always aware that getting access to such people might be a problem, and was prepared to pursue my queries with others in positions of responsibility whose views would be pertinent. That some details might be gathered in a web-site search, document analysis, post interview e-mail or a telephone conversation was also a 'given'.

Thus there was the intention to use a variety of methods in this study. It is important to point out here that the methods chosen represent an attempt to select what is appropriate to the *form* of the research question under review (see, for example, Green 2008: 58). One first needed to identify whether the question was a 'who', 'what', 'where' or 'how' type of question, and then identify a suitable research strategy. Though there may be large areas of overlap amongst the various strategies, nevertheless one strategy might be much more appropriate than another. For example, the case study method seemed more appropriate to ask the 'why and how' form of question, particularly in conjunction with a historical and political contextual analysis; 'why, when and in what manner' were forms of questions asked in qualitative interviews regarding faculty reactions to the arrival of league tables (Yin 2003:7-9) The table below attempts to match some forms of question with strategies which have been used in this research.

Table 3: Question Form and Research Strategies

Strategy	Form of research question	Requires control over behavioural events?	Focuses on contemporary events?
Literature review	how, why	no	yes
Secondary data analysis	who, what ,where, how many, how much	no	yes
History	how, why	no	no
Case study	how, why	no	yes
Qualitative Interviews	when, how	yes	yes

Adapted from Yin 2003

There now follows a consideration of the design of the interview schedule, the major instrument which followed from the research design process.

4.2.2 The Research Instrument

As indicated above, the principal research method used in the study was a semi-structured interview. In this section, the interview schedule (Appendix 1) will be described in general terms, followed by a detailed explanation of the influences which lay behind its construction. The schedule was designed by combining ideas from other researchers (who have researched, for example, into governance changes in HE) with some of my own ideas which emerged from the scoping study. The same schedule was

used as a basis for interviewing HODs (head of departments), deans of faculties or colleges, super-deans with responsibilities beyond the faculty, administrators, and in the case of Taiwan, a senior civil servant; different sections of the schedule were offered to individuals, as seemed appropriate.

Perhaps it should be reiterated here that the interview schedule was essentially a guide for my questioning. I hope that there is some logic to the schedule; in reality it was often difficult to manage the interviews, in the sense that the sequence suggested in the schedule was rarely adhered to by the respondent. This, I suggest, was not unusual when such a device is deployed, nor was it a particular problem; rich data was often collected when respondents followed a tangent! Many of the issues under examination are inter-related, and my informants often made links and connections during the time of the interview; thus the logic of the schedule here is purely academic. The schedule first asks general questions about the university, and then general questions about the faculty, before the role of the Dean is explored. This is followed by questions about the informants' views regarding reputation management at the institution. The schedule then explores the core variables regarding changes in practice, should these exist, in the institution: the management of research, the management of teaching, and the process of internationalisation.

The opening questions on the schedule (Section 1) attempted to gather some information about the context in which the respondent saw the university, and her own position within that context. I had learnt from the scoping study that it was important to establish this context early on, since after an hour's interview with a Taiwanese university President, I discovered that his primary goal for his institution was simply survival in a context of sector over-provision; his motives did not suit the aims of this particular study. These general context questions sought information about the status of the university, its relationship with other institutions, and comments about leadership styles. The latter arose from Marginson & Considine ideas regarding the emergence of 'emphatic leadership styles' (Marginson & Considine 2000: 234). I note here that one respondent (TR1) spoke for an hour (the entirety of the interview) on the first question of this section.

The second section of the schedule sought basic information about the faculty (or colleges, in Taiwan and PRC) of Social Science and the relationship between the faculty

and the institution. For example, I enquired about the numbers of faculty academic staff and departments, and the numbers of associate/deputy deans and their portfolio descriptions. There then followed a number of queries following McDaniel's questioning (McDaniel 1996) regarding faculty autonomy, for example, whether the faculty was free to select students and to determine course content without approval. The other important element to the questions in this section relates to re-organisation within the faculty, which stems from Marginson & Considine's notion of 'revolving door governance' (Marginson & Considine 2000: 234).

The role of the dean, and whether that had changed, was the focus of the third section. During the scoping study, it emerged in conversations with UK and HKSAR personnel that the role had indeed shifted. I was particularly interested in discovering whether 'dean-ing' had taken on more authority, and how much more strategic the position was, rather than operational; these questions are in line with those scholars who have posited that there has developed a more emphatic leadership style where the sidelining of collegiate structures can be observed (see for example, Marginson & Considine 2000, Chapters 4 and 5), and Lucas, who observes an increase in 'directive roles' (Lucas 2006: 85). Another factor driving my interest in this area was a conversation during the scoping study stage with a UK PVC (Pro Vice Chancellor), who had spoken to me about managers "getting a bit more intrusive" with regard to steering departments, strategies they were developing and decisions they were taking. This section of the interview schedule also commences the enquiries about reputation management, with questions about reputation management, buildings, pay premia, and organisational change. These questions also emerged from the scoping study, and were particularly associated with my first visit to IoHK.

The fourth section of the interview schedule aims to draw out information of a more detailed nature regarding the respondents' views concerning reputation building/management of the faculty or institution. These questions were informed by the 'international/pluri-scalar' approach to governance theory (for example, Dale 2005:132), from scoping study interviews with a PVC and a Dean in the UK, but most notably following my first visit to IoT, where reputation management was so explicit. When I asked who, or what authority was driving efforts to enhance reputation, if these existed, I was influenced by the discourses regarding the role of the nation state, the developmental state, and the competition state (see introductory chapter). Other

questions in this section relating to competition had the same origins. The questions relating to the significance of global league tables, and whether there had been attempts to deconstruct league tables at the university/faculty, were influenced by comments made by the UK PVC, and, of course, were informed by the literature regarding league tables; for example, Marginson claims that rankings and league tables shape the behaviour of universities and policy makers (Marginson 2007: 2) (see introductory chapter).

Policy and practice within the faculty, and changes in policy and practice were the focus of the final section of the schedule. The questions relating to the management of research are largely drawn from Lucas' recent investigation on this topic (Lucas 2006:131), which more than adequately (it seemed to me) provided a framework for my own study; since my case study institutions are research-intensive universities, it seemed necessary to dwell on the organisation of research in the faculty. The questions are centred on creating or cementing areas of research, managing and organising research, and developing a research environment and culture within the faculty. There are then a number of questions related to teaching within the faculty, questions which stem from scoping study interviews, particularly at IoT and IoUK, where there appeared to be issues regarding teaching and student satisfaction; they are also informed by my own work on the perceptions of Chinese Masters' students at universities in the UK. These questions are centred on the issues surrounding student feedback, whether a client based culture is being developed, and the relationship between teaching and reputation management. Finally, the process of internationalisation is addressed, emerging from my observations at the scoping study stage and the literature. I draw particularly on Knight (Knight 2004: 23-9) for the framework of these questions, which are concerned, for example, with the expressed interest and goals of SMT regarding internationalisation, academic programmes (for example, student exchanges, work and study abroad, staff exchanges, the institutions' position regarding overseas students/numbers/targets, and matters relating to research collaboration).

There now follows a consideration of some of the methods and issues which followed from the research design process.

4.2.3 Methods: A Consideration of Case Studies

Much of the data collected for this study is the result of research activity at the four case universities; indeed, HE is itself a case study of economic activity in East Asia. The case study as an approach to research is such an important feature of this study that some careful consideration will be given here as to their construction and use. These are case studies of university governance at faculty level; the hypothesis is that if the mechanisms (M) are powerful enough, then the differences in context (C) will be overwhelmed, resulting in converging outcomes (O). We have already seen that the case study approach fits in with the meta-theoretical position, but here the approach is used and discussed more generally. Writers suggest that the advantage of the case study design is to allow the collection of more detailed data than would be the case in a larger sample (Gilbert 2008: 36), and that whereas surveys are likely to answer the forms of questions such as 'who', 'what', 'where' and 'how many', a case study may be able to answer the 'how' and 'why' (Yin op.cit: 6). I used the case study as the preferred research strategy, since my intention was to probe the current operations of institutions, faculties and departments in looking for convergence: "The case study is preferred in examining contemporary events… two sources of evidence (which should be) included…. are direct observation and systematic interviewing." (ibid: 9). Creswell also suggests that multiple sources of information are necessary for a successful case study (Creswell 2007: 73).

Yin points out that there is disdain for the case study research method in some quarters (Yin 2003:7-9), because many such studies lack rigour, which in turn allows bias to influence the findings. In this context, he suggests that it is vital to refer to criteria for judging the quality of research designs. It is accepted in the literature that it is important to test the quality of any design against logical tests: "four tests have been commonly used to establish the quality of any empirical research" (Yin 2003: 32). It seems appropriate to address these issues here, despite the fact that some writers posit that 'reliability' and 'validity' are positivist terms, judged respectively against consistent results and external criteria (Gillam 2005: 6), and despite the argument that qualitative researchers should have the confidence to use other terms such as 'credibility' and 'transferability' in their place (Creswell op.cit: 18).

Meeting the challenge of constructing validity rests upon two issues, namely, specifying the types of changes to be studied, and ensuring that the measures of these changes reflect the types of change specified (see, for example, Gilbert op.cit:33). This can be adequately achieved by using multiple sources of evidence, establishing a chain of evidence and having the draft report reviewed by key informants. Internal validity represents a concern for case studies where an investigator or researcher is trying to forge a causal relationship between one factor and another (Yin op.cit: 35); this does not apply to exploratory or descriptive studies. The case studies employed here were indeed intended to offer explanations, aiming, for example, to explore the causal links, if any existed, between vectors outside the case study institutions and institutional change. Yin suggests the tactics which can overcome the difficulties of achieving internal validity are difficult to identify, but could include the analytical tactic of pattern matching. That the research targeted particular groups at each institution, that is, middle managers/Deans, provides an important measure of internal validity.

Testing for external validity represents the problem of judging how far the study's findings are able to be generalised outside the case study itself, though I seek only to illuminate. Critics typically state that single case studies offer little in the way of generalisable findings. Yin warns that case study research is based on analytical generalisation. It is advisable that the findings of one case study be tested in other situations, thus allowing the opportunity to build and test theory (ibid: 36); thus the topics under investigation might cover broader theoretical issues. This 'replication logic' is the same logic that is at the heart of experimental research. In this study, the fact that four case study institutions were employed allows both a measure of illumination across institutions, and the interviews could certainly be replicated elsewhere, but it has to be remembered that the case studies were chosen to have deliberately different characteristics.

The aim of achieving reliability in a case study is to minimise the errors and biases in a study (ibid: 36); the test for such a goal is to judge whether the same issues would emerge if the same study were carried out by a different researcher. In order to satisfy this test, clear recording of the procedures is essential; Yin suggests that their must be a case study protocol, that there must be careful development of a case study database, and that care should be taken to make as many of the steps as operational as possible in order that one might ensure "that an auditor could repeat the procedures and arrive at

the same results" (ibid: 37). The development of an interview schedule, detailed below, goes some way to assure a measure of reliability here.

The next section here will review the central research method used in this study, the interview.

4.2.4 Methods: A Consideration of Interviews

> "Whatever the aims of the social scientist, none can be reached without an understanding of the lives of the people who live in the society and the world. Qualitative interviewing is a tool for such an understanding." (Warren 2004: 524)

The citation above gives a clue as to the importance given in this study to the information revealed to the writer. As with the case study approach, interviewing was such a significant element in this research that it seems appropriate to devote some detailed attention to it here.

Let's first consider the type of interview I considered appropriate for this research. From the literature regarding interviewing emerges a consensus that "...different types of interviewing are suited to different situations" (Fontana and Frey 1994: 373). The typologies of interviewing extend along a continuum. At the end of that continuum is the unstructured interview where the interviewer has a list of topics which he may wish the respondent to talk about; the order and wording of each question will depend on the progress of the interview. Unstructured interviews are likely to be the only practical method when investigating policy and decision making issues at managerial level. Although such interviews may commence with a set of questions or topics, one's research is likely to benefit from an open minded approach which will allow the interviewee opportunities to digress and range around the issues in question. This type is considered particularly valuable "as strategies for discovery" (ibid: 124); rather than seeking "precise data of a code-able nature", the unstructured interview attempts to "understand the complex behaviours of members of society" (ibid: 706). Loftland agrees:

> "[The] object [of the non-standard interview] is to find out what kinds of things are happening rather than to determine the frequency of predetermined kinds of things that the researcher already believes can happen." (Loftland 1971: 76).

The literature points to the myriad pitfalls which may trap the unwary interviewer. O'Connel Davidson and Layder also argue that social researchers should continually reflect on the ways in which their values, mores and identity affect the information they seek to gather (O'Connel Davidson and Layder 1994: 53) and on the interpretation of those findings (ibid: 28). It was particularly important in this study, where information gathering took place across cultures, to be reflective in this regard. I often reflected on Said's warnings, which seemed pertinent to my situation:

> "...the reality is ...(that) ...no-one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of society (Said 1978: 10)....with a European or an American studying the Orient there can be no disclaiming his actuality: that he comes up against the Orient as a European or an American first, as an individual second" (ibid: 11)

As with any scholarly work involving interviews, it is important to guard against self-delusion on the part of the analyst with respect to the conclusions which he or she might make (Miles 1979: 591); illumination of issues may be possible, rather than generalisations (ibid: 591). Studies which have the interview as the central methodology should always carry the health warning that data gathered in this way is often less than neutral (Holstein and Gubrium 1995: 72, Hammersley 2003). In particular, the notion that 'open' interviews capture the genuine voices of interviewees is often questioned; rather, such voices can be "a methodically constructed social product that emerges from its reflexive communicative practices" (Gubrium and Holstein op.cit:11). I regard this as particularly valid in the context of my interactions with middle managers who would always be aware of what, and what not, it would be politic to disclose; I was particularly aware of this as I interviewed a Dean who taught Law! Thus, as Holliday points out, "...take what they say as evidence of what they wish to point out, rather than as information about where they come from" (Holliday et al, 2004:48). This is discussed further in a later section (page 95)

There is much questioning in the literature regarding the interview process about the "capacity of interviews to provide accurate representations, either of the self or of the world" (Hammersley op.cit: 1). Such doubts emerge from the view that interviews are more constructed social interactions than opportunities to collect objective data about beliefs or ideas of behaviour. Thus the interview is seen as a contextual social situation where the respondent may well be driven by the need to self-represent, possibly at the persuasion of the interviewer. Ozga and Gewirtz's phrase 'the disturbing and contaminating presence of the researcher' captures the extreme perception of this social situation (Ozga and Gewirtz 1994:133). Others take a more realist view: writing about the tradition of reflexive disclosure on the part of researchers, Troyna is unconvinced that 'baring their souls' necessarily enhances the rigour of the research (Troyna 1994). However one positions oneself in this debate, I feel an obligation here to involve myself in 'intelligent self awareness or self examination' (the OED's definition of reflexivity).

> "To be reflexive we need to be *aware* of our personal responses and to be able to make choices about how to use them. We also need to be aware of the personal, social and cultural contexts in which we live and work and to understand how these impact on the ways we interpret the world." Etherington, 2004:18

How much did my personality or experience influence the data? I have always found a non-threatening and sympathetic self presentation to be a useful research tactic. Whether this is personality or simply a skills-set is difficult to discern. I have some years of experience as an interviewer of teenagers in the setting of a state secondary school, and as a team-manager; I have acquired the language of the manager, the change maker. I recognise the tension between an institution and the individual. I have a genuine interest in people and their reactions to responsibilities. For me, then, an interview is a point of interest and engagement, an opportunity for sharing ideas, possibly punctuated by humour. Whether the data I collected would be significantly different to the data collected by another researcher, given the same research instrument, remains a question for me. I leave this issue here and move on to more prosaic matters.

In order to establish some guidelines on how best to approach interviews with senior and middle managers, I interviewed an experienced researcher (Mok, 2006a); he suggested a set of ideas to bear in mind for this type of activity. In general, his advice echoed the ideas in the literature; as Gillam insists:

> "Real life research does not take place in a setting designed for research. Thus the real life researcher constantly has to adapt or compromise on methods because of the constraints encountered" (Gillam 2005).

One consideration was with regard to the 'busy-ness' of the interviewees. Such people were likely to be called away from an interview arrangement at a moment's notice. It was highly likely that one might have to see a deputy rather than the person one might have wished to see. It is up to the interviewer to be aware of these problems and accept that one might on occasions be disappointed.

Preparation prior to such an interview is likely to be crucial to its success. I strived for an awareness of pertinent institutional, local and national events and debates which I could allude to at interview. The interviewer ought to have sent an interview guide to the interviewee some time before the event. In so doing, he should have rigorously determined the areas for 'discussion', and during the interview he should not deviate from those topics; in practice I found this most difficult! Then there are the skills which the interviewer needs if the occasion is to be a success; Mok suggests that the attitude of

the researcher is important. He has to maintain his independence and autonomy, but at the same time being aware of the need to show humility, and gratitude for the opportunity which has been afforded him. It may be necessary for him to act a little foolishly on occasions in order that a point of interest may be clarified. At other times, he may have to be diplomatic, asking for enlightenment about certain issues, perhaps suggesting that other sources had painted a different picture regarding that issue. But Mok always suggests courtesy, even empathy; an empathetic approach may take a stance in favour of the group or individual being studied, with the interviewer becoming partner or advocate, perhaps even hoping to be able to use the results if not to improve the conditions for the interviewee (Denzin & Lincoln 2005:702), then at least to reflect the difficulties which the respondents may find themselves in.

And a final but important note in this section about interviewing the 'powerful' relates to ethical considerations:

> "I give you the experience of meeting one of the deputy presidents of a university in Asia...I kept on reassuring him that the data would be used for such and such purposes, and if at interview he or she does not wish to have their names used, then I assure them about that. You have to make a promise about that ...but in reporting your observations you may say that during your interviews these issues were raised, without mentioning names." (Mok 2006a)

From this extract a number of generic ideas which are ethical in nature, such as confidentiality, emerge, which will be briefly explored in the next section.

4.2.5 Ethical Issues

The dimensions of ethical considerations include the moral, the legal and the practical (see, for example, The British Sociological Association's Statement of Ethical Practice); some of these are self-evident in the extract from Mok above. Regarding the 'moral', Mok above underscores the need for the researcher to protect the interviewees' identity, without sacrificing the duty to report key issues, though the researcher must always recognise the need to avoid harm. To be explicit, this research project involved working with human subjects, through direct, active communication, and it was therefore my duty to uphold the conventions of ethical research practice, to respect the cultural diversity of the participants and to protect their confidentiality, to assess their competence and to understand their capacity to consent. Regarding the latter two points, I had complete confidence in their competence to assist with the project, and unpressured voluntary consent was always sought and obtained for every interview; see Appendix 2 for the pro-forma offered to each respondent.

Returning for a moment to the consideration of avoiding harm, the notion that the well-being of the human research participant should take precedence over the interests of science and society has been accepted in western research ethics since the Declaration of Helsinki in 1964. In this research, confidentiality and anonymity went hand-in-hand when dealing with a participant's information. In all instances data was anonymised or coded so that a third party would not be able to connect the data to the individual.

There were also legal and practical dimensions to be considered. All HEIs (in the UK) are obliged to have policies on research governance, and these are often layered within the institution (department/faculty/university); for this project, procedures relating to the anonymity of respondents and institutions were negotiated with the Centre Ethics Committee, as were assurances to respondents, for example, allowing each respondent to withdraw at any stage of the study, and relating to the protection and life-cycle of the interview recordings. The latter is a legal issue involving the correct handling of data, with the emphasis on safeguarding all information collected, and its availability to those who have provided it (Bulmer 2008:152). Anyone processing personal data must comply with the eight principles of the Data Protection Act which state that these data

must be: fairly and lawfully processed, processed for specified purposes, adequate, relevant and not excessive, accurate, not kept longer than necessary, processed in accordance with the data subject's rights, secure from unauthorised access or alteration and not transferred to countries without adequate data protection (Data Protection Act 1998).

Despite the assurances that I present above, it is still worth asking where I place myself on the ethical terrain. Perhaps I was open to some dilemmas; there were some areas which were ethically problematical. For example, I did not declare my theoretical position with reference to critical realism. Instead I said I was interested in the role of reputation and its management. In Taiwan and Hong Kong, as I have explained, my first enquiries were (genuinely) related to the process of internationalisation, and though my focus shifted towards globalisation, in later interviews I did not correct participants who assumed that an understanding of internationalisation was my primary goal; it may have been politeness that prompted me towards silence. There were, then, diluted versions of my intentions in order to gain, or to continue, access. And there is the issue of whether a third party might be able to connect the data to a particular institution, and perhaps to an individual; the necessary descriptions of the case study institutions might lead some to guess the locale, when one was discussing such relatively small nations as Taiwan and Hong Kong.

4.2.6 The Cross-Cultural Aspect

Though this study is not strictly a cross-cultural piece, in that cultures are not compared, there is undoubtedly an element of cross-cultural research which requires addressing at a theoretical level. Behaviour and attitudes are unique to each culture (Gudykunst 2000: 294); clearly the informants in this study are experiencing different behaviours, attitudes, practices and expectations, in that most are Chinese, and some are European. Differences between cultures, and indeed similarities, have been explained and reflected upon using such notions as individualism-collectivism (henceforth referred to as I-C) (ibid: 296). Would the Chinese professionals in this study exhibit the characteristics of a group identity as opined by Hofstede and Bond?

> "In individualistic cultures, people are supposed to look after themselves and their immediate family only, and in collectivistic cultures, people belong to in-groups or collectives which are supposed to look after them in exchange for loyalty" (Hofstede and Bond 1984: 427).

Though I-C exists in all cultures, it is widely accepted that the UK is found on the individualistic end of the spectrum, and China towards the collectivistic (Hofstede 1980); how far this impacts on attitudes in this study is clearly an issue. Individual behaviours are mediated by three characteristics: personalities, values and self-construal (Gudykunst op.cit). Of these, the latter two are worth considering here:

> "The value domains of stimulation, hedonism, power, achievement, and self-direction serve individual interests; the value domains of tradition, conformity, and benevolence serve collective interests; and the value domains of security, universalism, and spirituality serve mixed interests." (ibid: 297)

These domains will be borne in mind, though not closely dissected, when analysing informants' responses, as will the way in which they see themselves, the construal of self. Do the informants emphasise their uniqueness, their own goals, do they express themselves directly, or is interdependence dominant? Do they recognise that "one's own behaviour is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent organized by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings and actions of others in the relationship" (Markus and Kitayama 1991: 227)? Do they accept that what is most appropriate is to "fit in with the in-group, act in an appropriate fashion, promote the in-group's goals, occupy their proper place, to be indirect, and read other people's minds" (ibid: 228)?

Having pointed out the cultural differences which might exist, I should also point out a certain commonality which may have had the effect of reducing those cultural differences. My respondents seemed to have few problems in interpreting what I said; there was a common technical language, the language of HE management, which minimised the chance of being misunderstood, and which gave a linguistic equivalence across the separate interviews.

In the following section, I engage in reflections regarding the progress of the study and some of the difficulties which arose.

4.3 The Study: Progress and Problems

4.3.1 How the study progressed

This study grew out of a scoping study, conducted over the course of a two year period, which pondered the processes and effects of globalisation in East Asia on HE; the focus of that scoping study revolved around the impact of internationalisation on institutional practices. The study commenced in October 2006. The overall objective of the scoping study was to design the framework for a larger scale study on the same theme; it allowed the final proposal to be analysed and fleshed out and a judgement to be made about its feasibility and viability, and provided a broad overview of the key issues in the study which was to follow. It involved desk research, attendance at conferences and seminars, and interviews with academics and middle managers of HE institutions in Asia and in the UK; some of the data from that period is used in this study. During the course of the scoping study I visited three universities in Hong Kong, two universities in PRC, two universities in Taiwan, and two universities in the UK. The specific objectives of the scoping study were to investigate what role Deans performed in HE institutions, and to identify the issues most relevant to the study, the institutions and informants who would best suit the purposes of the study, the research questions and the desired outputs of the main study.

The scoping study part of the research, and especially the interviews, confirmed the assumption behind the project that there was a need for a close look at the role of reputation management as a feature of the globalisation of HE, as illustrated in the Introduction to this piece. This theme assumed particular importance following my first visit to two Taiwanese universities. The scoping study also led me to believe that it would be better to focus on one case study per nation; even with one case study, there would be a surfeit of data. One of the key questions concerned where to seek my data; this seemed vital when the research project is limited in scope. I reiterate my reasons here for approaching this study from the viewpoint of the Dean. Crucially, I interpret that role of the Dean as straddling the strategic and the operational within the university; as a result, he/she may be able to provide a researcher with a view of the pressures which shape strategy, because the Dean is necessarily involved with senior managers,

and he/she may also be able to provide a view of governance and how governance may be re-fashioned as a response to the aforementioned pressures.

The main study commenced in the beginning months of 2009; by this time the central issues and research questions (see the beginning of this chapter for research questions) were identified, key informants were identified and contacted to ensure they might assist in the project, ethical issues were negotiated with my Centre, and timetables and milestones were set.

As above explained before, for each nation represented in the study (PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong and UK), a case study university was chosen with two criteria in mind: firstly, the case study would represent a top ten university within each nation, and secondly, each chosen case study would have unique features would allow greater illumination of the research questions. Thus, during the scoping study, I judged that Institute of China (IoC), the Institute of Taiwan (IoT), the Institute of Hong Kong (IoHK), and the Institute of the United Kingdom (IoUK) each had distinctive qualities which would add to the study's findings. IoC was a very large institution which was a focus for national investment, that is, one of an identified elite; IoT was the flagship university for the nation, which had strong and direct links with MoE; IoHK had strong colonial links from the past which gave it a unique character, and had recently developed an interesting faculty model; IoUK represented the smaller institution which had a very traditional, western style of governance, and which appeared to have resource issues. This purposeful sampling follows Creswell's notion of "selecting cases which show different perspectives on the problem or process under study" (Creswell 2007: 75), and I argue that each of these cases sheds light on the notion of reputation management in informative ways.

The scoping study also allowed the identification of institutions which could provide adequate data for the study. For example, regarding the case study institution for PRC, I had originally hoped to use data from a different institution, which I will refer to in this paragraph as IoC2. I regarded IoC2 as ideal, in that it was a very well funded university with a wide range of international links, driven by a President with a reputation for energy, drive and determination. I visited the institution twice, having been kindly introduced to the potential respondents by a Chinese professor; despite having these contacts, including a Dean, my attempts to establish a network of potential

interviewees, and to secure fruitful interview appointments, did not materialise. The interviews I was able to conduct yielded little of value. Instead, I was asked to talk to a number of postgraduate student groups, to participate in research methods classes, and to be generally useful within the College, all of which was extremely interesting, and well rewarded with excellent hospitality.

As part of the scoping study, I had always intended to visit two institutions in each nation; I first visited IoC, the case study institution which appears in this study, in October 2007. I approached the institution in the same way as the university above, in so far as I was introduced by a Chinese friend who had worked and studied at IoC. The difference was that, at IoC, those whom I wanted to see had been briefed and cajoled by my acquaintance into agreeing to be interviewed, and my good fortune in this respect allowed the collection of what I considered to be very useful data. Upon my return to IoC in the following year, I was able to pick up where I had left off, renew my acquaintance with some of those who had kindly seen me the year before, and those respondents in turn arranged time with other key personnel who were able to fill some of the (many) gaps in the data.

Negotiating access to middle managers was also enabled for me at IoHK and IoT by personnel within the institutions. At IoT, following a speculative e-mail enquiry, a mid-level civil servant who took it upon herself to support my queries; she arranged a series of high level interviews for me, both at the scoping stage in 2008 and later when the study was more closely defined, in 2009. At IoHK, I was supported by two professors whom I had known in the UK; they too arranged access for me at the level Deputy Vice Chancellor, Dean and Associate Dean, at various institutions. In the UK, I was able to access senior and middle managers mostly through speculative e-mail enquiries (by which I mean requests for interviews). Appendix 3 shows the anonymised respondents, their institutions, and their responsibilities.

In the following section, I describe how the data was analysed.

4.3.2 Data Analysis Issues

As stated above, there are many warnings in the literature regarding the pitfalls of the analysis of qualitative research. "The analyst...has few guidelines for protection against self-delusion" (Miles 1979: 591). "If the method of research cannot be described and

scrutinized, it is difficult to have confidence in the findings put forward" (Punch: 2005: 195). Despite the fact that 'illumination' of the issues herein was the realistic aim, it seemed important to deal with the data in a scholarly, organised and rigorous way: though 'reproducibility' (ibid: 195) might not be possible, at least a second analyst might be able to follow the analytical trail.

Strauss and Corbin's approach to data collection and analysis most closely represents the method used in this study. In the approach they describe, data collection does not occur as a separate discrete stage in the research process, with the analysis following the data collection (Strauss and Corbin 1998). Instead, as described in the section above, an initial set of data was collected and then analysed in the early 'scoping' part of the project. Following sets of data, collected in later field visits, were then analysed on the basis of the emerging directions in that analysis. This cycle of 'theoretical sampling' continued until 'theoretical saturation' was achieved, or until new categories ceased to provide any new theoretical concept. The point of this process was to identify core categories at 'high level of abstraction but grounded in the data'. This involved firstly identifying 'conceptual categories' in the data, secondly to find 'relationships between these categories', and lastly to find abstract levels of reason to explain why these categories are linked.

Strauss and Corbin refer to these three levels as '*open coding*', '*axial coding*' and '*selective coding*' (op.cit: 210). The open coding phase functions to locate the substantive codes in the data, the axial coding phase functions to link the substantive codes with the theoretical codes, and the selective coding phase functions to conceptualize the theoretical codes into core categories (op. cit:211). This coding process is aimed at exploring the data to better understand the links between league tables and operations in the Faculty. Of course, this approach has the advantage of allowing the perspective of the participants to be known.

The Miles and Huberman framework (1994, 2nd Edition) is the approach which best describes the techniques of analysis at the selective coding phase. This identifies three components which are interwoven through the analysis: data reduction, data display and the drawing of conclusions. In this study, reduction took place through coding and tagging pieces of data which were emerging as central themes. Further themes and interrelationships were identified by memo-ing, "the write-up of ideas … as they strike

the analyst ... (in) a sentence, a paragraph" (ibid: 72). Punch describes coding as the systemic part of the process and memo-ing as the "more creative-speculative part of the developing analysis" (Punch 2005: 202). The analytical codes used in the analysis of the data were as follows, and shows the significance of the meta-theoretical approach in the first group of (context-relevant) criteria (see page 79-81 for a reasoned explanation of these codes):

1.1: the context of (global/regional/international) competition

1.2: a context of league tables

1.3: a context of organisational change

2.1: the role of the Dean

2.2: strategies for reputation building

2.3: the research culture of the institution

2.4: the process of internationalisation

2.5: the teaching culture

Conclusions were then drawn, harvesting the ideas from coding and memo-ing into an integrated and coherent picture of the data (see Appendix 4 for an exemplar of an interview transcription and the coding/memo-ing process).

I now move onto some reflections about the problems of data collection.

4.3.3 Reflections on Problems in Data Collection

Of course, there were many problems with the data gathering. Because the people I was interviewing were so busy, interviews were sometimes cut short or re-scheduled. The result was that there were many gaps in the data; these had to be filled in with e-mail enquiries, phone calls and the like. I recognised that each interview was crucial to my study, and when, as so often during an unstructured interview, the respondent drifted off tangentially from my query, I tried desperately to steer the interviews in the direction I wanted; during transcription, I could hear my own desperation on the digital recorder. There were other times when this spilled over into interruptions (on my part), which could have been interpreted as rudeness.

There were moments when I lost confidence in my choice of respondents. Was the Dean the best person to speak to? Is that post of responsibility too reactive and less

operationally-creative than I had judged? But by that stage I was committed to the process and the design.

What about the power relations within the interview situation? My concerns were about disclosure: how valid would 'that which was disclosed' be? How are these issues theorized in the literature? Ball, for example, posits that one needs to be cautious when interpreting data which has been elicited from interviews with those in positions of some responsibility, and suggests three ways in which the data can be interpreted. One can see the data as accounts of what happened, descriptions of events, of debates and emerging policy. One can see the data as discourses 'which speak the policy and speak the actors (rather than the reverse)' (Ball 1994:108). Finally, Ball sees the possibility of such data as 'interest representation', 'indicative of structural and relational constraints and influences which play upon policy making' (ibid: 108).

I also had concerns about how much would the interviewees would disclose to me; how much could one expect these persons, who were in positions of some considerable authority, to reveal to a stranger the changes in practice in which they may have been intimately involved, and indeed which may have caused pain and upset. As a humble PhD researcher, clearly I had the wrong end of the stick as far as power was concerned, and I was genuinely grateful for any time or information which I was offered. I was also at a disadvantage with regard to language; the majority of my interviews were conducted in English with those whose mother tongue was Mandarin. There were occasions when there were three or more people in the room when Mandarin was used to clarify details between the Mandarin speakers; there were times when I suspected that such discussion related to which version of the truth, or how much of it, should be revealed to me.

But the situation was more complex. For one thing, I was more mature, at least in years, than the large majority of the interviewees: I sensed that this did make a difference in, shall we say, being taken seriously. And there were strategies which I adopted in adding to this advantage. Careful preparation allowed me to use the language of the manager, in a further attempt to suggest that this interviewer at least knew the territory. I would present scenarios to suggest that I had spoken to others, in different institutions, to promote the idea that this was a serious piece of research. The data was collected in the context of these difficulties, which was always balanced by the

kindness and generosity shown to me.

At this point, I come to end of the first part of the study, with its attention to underlying concepts and methodologies. The next part focuses on a different area, that of the national context of the HE system under examination, and on the findings which emerged from those contexts.

Part B: Contexts and Findings

Foreward to Part II

There are a number of points which need making in the pre-amble to this chapter. Firstly, I am writing for the well-informed reader with an understanding of the structures of HE, someone with the knowledge of the well-informed citizen; clearly how much context I give depends on that assumption of knowledge.

Secondly, I am writing for an international audience, not a UK audience; as a result, I make no assumptions, for example, regarding the development of UK universities, or what is normal to those who currently work in the sector. Following directly from this, the UK chapter is of greater length than the case study chapters which follow. I justify this on the grounds that the model of the university as it is generally accepted around the world evolved in Europe, and some of the earliest institutions developed in what is now described as the UK. Thus some of the description here is applicable in a very general sense to the other case studies. In the case study of a Hong Kong university (in a later chapter), there are elements in this chapter which help us to understand some of the developments, and nomenclature, in that case study.

I also need to point out that some of the research in this chapter draws upon the scoping study part of this piece. As explained in the Research Methods chapter, I visited a number of universities at that stage of the study, and some of the information or data collected at that stage is referred to in the UK chapter, where that data may strengthen or clarify an argument, or point to a different interpretation, or simply provide interest. The analysis here also draws upon information from websites of the case study institutions, or policy documents produced by those institutions.

In the interests of anonymity, I have used the terms Institute of UK (IoUK), Institute of China (IoC), Instiute of Hong Kong (IoHK) and Institute of Taiwan (IoT), to replace the names of the case study university. I use the term IoUK2 to denote a further institution, that is, one particular institution, as described above, where information was collected during the scoping study. The respondents are coded, for example, UK Respondent (UKR), followed by a numeric, such as UKR1.

There is a commonality to the way in which the following four chapters are organized. Essentially, the chapters follow the data templates described previously. So, following an introduction, there is a section which examines the contexts of the nations which form part of the study. There is then an analysis of the findings of the empirical study, again, following the data template (see research design), which is presented in two sections. Finally, there is a concluding section.

Chapter 5. The Institute of UK: Contexts and Findings

This chapter examines the context in which the IoUK developed, and the findings from the empirical part of the study.

5.1 Introduction

Situated off the north-west coast of mainland Europe, the UK is a relatively small island nation state (243,000 square kilometres) with a population of just over 60 million. In the first millennium A.D., the island was subject to invasions first from Imperial Rome, and in the second half of the millennium from peoples of north and north-west Europe, including Vikings, Danes and Saxons. In the millennium which followed, the island developed as a separate political entity, with the larger English population becoming the dominant group.

As the UK nation state developed, it became prosperous and innovative, and emerged during the nineteenth century as the dominant world power. It owed this position to the coming together of a number of factors, which included internal stability, strong leadership, advanced military technology, widespread trading interests, the development of a financial system, and of course, an interest in science and technology. The latter was underpinned by a HE system which educated the children of the elite, and this has developed into the present recognisably national system with its own characteristics of style and governance.

As the UK's power waned during the twentieth century, and into the twenty-first, it nevertheless retained a presence in the top flight of world nations. It remains an important centre of finance and trade, and has chosen to continue along the trajectory of integration into the global economy. Having lost its early advantages in manufacturing, successive governments of the last fifty years have turned towards the knowledge economy as a means to secure its future. And for the last forty years, the UK has increasingly looked towards the nations of the Europe Union, perhaps rather grudgingly, as necessary partners in a world dominated by larger political entities.

5.2 The Development of HE: Political, Economic and Social Contexts

One of the features of HE in the UK is its gradual development over a millennium. Early features of governance were institutional independence and autonomy; latterly these have been eroded, as financial and governance structures have changed from the local to the central. Vaira's analysis of the recent global situation must surely apply to the UK:

> "HE is witnessing a process of deep institutional change that involves the deinstitutionalization of its rooted policy and values frameworks and the parallel institutionalization of new ones." (Vaira 2004: 485)

Today's UK HE institutions remain formally autonomous degree-awarding entities. This independence remains very important, but has also been accompanied by an increasing integration into national economic planning, and more recently still, by integration into the supra-national structures of the EU. Of particular interest and significance here are the last two decades, when deliberate policy structures have been put in place from the centre, in order to introduce a managerialism intent upon directing the sector, and directing it efficiently. In order to analyse briefly the central developments of HE in the UK, I will use five time periods:

- The Medieval period to the nineteenth century: a long period of autonomy and gradual development
- 1826-1950: a period of growth in the number of autonomous institutions
- 1950-1973: the post-war era when HE became locked into the national economy
- 1973-1992: NPM and an era of shrinking resources and shrinking independence
- The post-1992 era: 'the industrialisation of research activities' (UKR1), the establishment of central policy levers, and an emerging global market.

5.2.1 The Medieval Period to the Nineteenth Century

The development of HE in the UK cannot be separated from the genesis of the European university, which has very deep roots; etymologically, the word 'university' comes from the Latin 'universitas', meaning the whole, and was used to describe an assembly of scholars or students. Universities evolved in a number of mainland

European towns and cities in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in order to provide mutual support and assistance; in the European continent of city states at that time, security was by no means assured. Thus they were organisations intended to limit the encroachments of the local townspeople, unruly elements, the bishop, the prince, "or anyone else who tried to exert too much control" (Pounds 1968: 96). "From such simple beginnings the great universities arose…the very names of these institutions breathe a strange, nostalgic fascination: Salerno, Bologna, and Paris; Salamanca, Oxford, and Padua; Montpellier, Valladolid, and Prague; Angers, Heidelberg, and Uppsala" (Schachner 1938: 42).

Scholars suggest that in northern Europe, the development of universities was very much linked to the Church, the authority of the day. In southern Europe, these institutions were paradoxically more secular in outlook, and were strictly lay institutions, despite being closer to Rome, the epicentre of that authority (Pounds op. cit: 99, Schachner op. cit: 12). Though in general terms this secularity evolved as the norm, in England, Oxford and Cambridge have been associated with the Establishment and with the Church of England, and remain so today (Stevens 2004: 7). Stevens recalls Thomas Cranmer's view of the role of the sixteenth century university as a "supplier of persons duly qualified to serve Thee (God) and the State" (ibid: 6).

The scholarly ideas debated in the early universities did not remain fixed in one locale; thus another salient feature of the times was the notion that learning and travel were natural partners. Schachner posits that during the twelfth century, scholars were quite prepared to travel to other parts of Europe in search of knowledge, despite the fact that there were no particular entrance examinations, no set courses, no degrees at the end of the process, no particular buildings where the learning took place (Schachner op.cit:43).

"The twelfth century was the beginning of a hegira unprecedented in the history of the world. From the ends of Europe…they poured in an increasing flood to the centres of where learning could be had, where they could literally sit at the feet of the great teachers and absorb wisdom" (ibid: 25).

Thus, HE in this period was just as much linked to physical movement as it is today. That we could not describe Medieval universities as international institutions rests only

on the fact that the nation state had not arrived! The reasons for study varied; clearly there was some professional advantage to study law or medicine at the southern European schools, though motivations may have been more cerebral in the colleges of the north, where theology and philosophy were of greater import. There was an international *lingua franca*, Latin; that the system could cope with a travelling community of scholars and students rested on a common language of communication, again, as it does today. However, with the emerging nation state, and the loss of influence from Rome, the vernacular had widely replaced Latin by the sixteenth century.

The ancient universities which developed in the British Isles include some illustrious names. They are, in order of formation:

- The University of Oxford – founded before 1167
- The University of Cambridge – founded 1209
- The University of St Andrews – founded 1413 (incorporating the University of Dundee for part of its history)
- The University of Glasgow – founded 1451
- The University of Aberdeen – founded 1495 by (as King's College, Aberdeen)
- The University of Edinburgh – founded 1583
- The University of Dublin (Trinity College) – founded 1592 (Palfreyman 2001:9).

Although these universities grew internally[13], no new universities were established in the British Isles until the early part of the nineteenth century. Their exponential growth seen since will be discussed later.

5.2.2 1826-1945

I have chosen these dates to reflect a century and more of the progression in the university system. Until the establishment of University College, London, in 1826, the British Isles (as we have seen) had only seven universities, and England had only two:

---

[13] Oxford and Cambridge were in many respects federations of colleges; over the centuries additional colleges were founded and admitted.

Oxford and Cambridge. Both were large institutions at this time, which had grown to incorporate new colleges as and when these had developed. The new University College, London was non-denominational, which set it apart from its erstwhile Anglican establishments.

From this time, there developed a wide interest throughout the country in the establishment of institutes of higher learning, evidenced by the histories of many of the UK's present institutions. We have to place this interest against the dynamic social, political and economic context of Victorian Britain. This was a Britain which had stumbled upon the industrial revolution, which had been so endowed with wealth from colonial adventures that a banking system had emerged which circulated and compounded that wealth and allowed others to borrow. Victorian Britain was the forerunner of the export-led economic growth model. The result was prosperity for some, a growing middle-class, a developing civic society, social improvement and political activity. Regarding political developments, it was in the Victorian era that the centralised nature of British government was cemented, a style of government which always had the potential to control the education sector (Stevens 2004: 5).

It is also important to place these developments in the international context, as well as the domestic. As an imperial power, Britain also exported this interest in higher learning to other parts of the world, as demonstrated in an earlier chapter with the development of an HEI in Hong Kong. And during this period there developed the presence of international students in British universities. These students came from all parts of the empire, and were usually from the emerging middle classes spawned by colonial development; they were often destined to return to their origins to administer the colony from whence they came. Their histories are often demonstrated in biographies and autobiographies such as Hong Kong's Adeline Yen Mah (Yen Mah 1997).

The conditions of economic and social improvement in Britain, described above, allowed a seed-bed for a burgeoning interest in education at all levels, which was encouraged in most locales by endowments from wealthy philanthropists. And there is evidence of the social changes which these new institutions were championing: the case study institution, IoUK, was the first college in the country to admit men and women on

an equal footing. When the King signed the charter for the IoUK in 1909, it is interesting to note that the local council assisted in its finances by raising taxes from the townsfolk. This was clearly a local enterprise; the centre (Whitehall) was pleased to allow such developments, and it was not at this stage concerned with controlling and directing, a situation which was to change.

The mechanisms for control from the centre were first established during this period, though perhaps not intentionally. The creation of the UGC (University Grants Committee) was first proposed in 1904, though it was not created until 1918, to provide a mechanism to channel funds to universities which had suffered from neglect and a lack of funding during the First World War. It was charged with examining the financial needs of the universities and to advise on grants, but it did not have a remit to plan for the development of universities. However, the Barlow report of 1946 recommended that the UGC take on a planning role for the university sector, to ensure that universities were adequate for national needs during post-war reconstruction; this planning role was to strengthen later in the century (Shattock 1994).

Evident from the above, the foundation of new universities was a slow process, and they provided a surprisingly narrow base. In 1950, for example, only two percent of the age cohort attended university (Scott 2001:189, Stevens 2004:11). This, then, was still an elitist system, but the seeds of change had taken root. The six 'red brick'[14] universities, which were founded in the industrial cities of Victorian England, achieved university status before the Second World War; importantly, they were non-collegiate institutions that admitted students without specific reference to their religion or family background, unlike the more elitist ancient universities. Thus they heralded the great social revolutions which were in train; contemporaneously, as we will see in Chapter 6, similar ideological upheavals were occurring in China. But during the twentieth century, it was not only a social revolution in which UK universities had become embroiled; in the

---

[14] The term 'red brick' was first used in a publication by a professor of Spanish (Edgar Allison Peers). The reference was inspired by the fact that The Victoria Building at the University of Liverpool is built from a distinctive red pressed brick, with terracotta decorative dressings. The original six civic 'red brick' universities were Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield.

period which followed the Second World War, these institutions were to experience a shift in governance which was to disrupt their Medieval roots.

5.2.3 1950-1973

In the first half of the twentieth century, university governance in the UK was 'medieval' (Stevens op.cit:67, Kain, 2008), in the sense that little had changed since those times: the faculty was king, central direction was minimal, and self-confidence was high (Scott 2001:190). University autonomy (a term which perhaps more correctly referred to the autonomy of the scholar), it was claimed, was an essential pre-condition for the disinterested search for knowledge, and the preservation of those values on which civilised society depends. To question the right to this autonomy was therefore to question the basis of society's civilised existence (Salter& Tapper1994:10; Stevens op.cit.). In the UK, funding arrangements had evolved which made this much-heralded autonomy apparently very secure: essentially, the post-war Labour government had continued the arrangement of 1919, whereby the Treasury simply granted the UGC[15] monies which were in turn handed to the institutions. During the 1950s and 1960s, these ideas were challenged; one might argue that the turn from the confident modernity of HE to an ambivalent postmodernism began (Scott op.cit:192).

Scholars have demonstrated the encroachment of the notion, during the 1950s and 1960s, that the goal of education was to serve the economic needs of the nation, at which point all else is subjugated to that goal (Salter & Tapper op.cit:12-15, Scott op.cit:190). Eventually, the state insisted that there could be no shirking of education's economic duty; thus the economic ideology of education legitimised the state's managerial role (Salter & Tapper op.cit: 13); China's (PRC) leaders had arrived at this same decision some years earlier. Salter and Tapper posit that the pressure for change in the UK resulted from the intersection of three dynamics: the economy, the dominant state bureaucracy, and political interests. They suggest that the latter two have interpreted and channelled the demands of the economy in a way which suits its own interests and policy preferences (Salter & Tapper op.cit: 3) and that all states of the latter twentieth century assumed a natural, perhaps legitimate interest in HE, since HE is the foundation of the modern economy: it is a supplier of both technical manpower and

---

[15] The UGC consisted of academics, making the system even more comfortable! (Stevens: op cit: 9)

the innovation necessary for economic growth and also has a central role in widening social opportunities. The pressures upon the state to respond to the economic dynamic were overwhelming and inescapable (ibid: 18), and remain so. (This is not to say that the state may fail in its policies or its desired results; but it will make an attempt to drive HE in the direction it perceives to be best for the nation).

The changed nature of the state's power relationship with the universities became embedded in administrative and financial arrangements. Stevens claims that the years 1960-1964 were in fact crucial in the transformation of HE in the UK (Stevens op.cit:15). For example, 1964 saw the coming together of research councils and funding bodies under the Department for Education and Science (the Ministry then responsible for HE): "the consolidation of state control had begun" (Salter & Tapper op.cit:36) and that state vision included a vastly expanded system.

Following the Robbins Report (HMSO 1963), commissioned by the government, the pattern of HE in the UK changed significantly[16]: seven new universities were built on greenfield sites during the later 1960s, and eight former Colleges of Advanced Technology (CATs) were awarded university status, thus grafting onto the university system these more vocationally orientated institutions, which were not funded to carry out research. Further, the report recommended that "courses of HE should be available to all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them and who wish to do so"; this heralded a huge expansion. For example, between 1963 and 1968, the number of students at the University of Exeter almost doubled (Harvey op.cit:38), and no fewer than ten major buildings were completed.[17]

---

[16] All White papers and government reports since have confirmed this thinking; one of the latest such commissions, referred to generally by its author's name as The Dearing Report, sets out the argument as it has developed: "With increasing competition from developed and developing nations, and given the possibility of locating business operations anywhere in the world as a result of the development of communications and information technology, nations will need, through investment in people, to equip themselves to compete at the leading edge of economic activity. In the future, competitive advantage for advanced economies will lie in the quality, effectiveness and relevance of their provision for education and training, and the extent of their shared commitment to learning for life." (HMSO 1997)

[17] These included homes for the Chemistry and Physics departments, the Newman, Laver and Engineering Buildings and Streatham Court. Queen's Building had been opened for the Arts Faculty in 1959 and the Amory Building, housing Law and Social Sciences, followed in 1974.

But crucially, Robbins, himself an economist, cemented that change in direction noted above: HE was henceforth linked to the state and its economy. It is significant that the first principle in the terms of reference given to Robbins reads as follows: "There should be maximum participation in initial HE by young and mature students and in lifetime learning by adults, having regard to the needs of individuals, the nation, and the future labour market" (HMSO 1963).

5.2.4 1973 - Present

This was also an era when the UK was facing economic decline; indeed, the sentiments above were partly a response to that decline. Falling government revenues, increasing life expectancy and escalating social expectations had created a fiscal environment that could no longer support the welfare state envisioned after the Second World War. There was financial pressure in all government departments, and in 1973, the first budget cut (executed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer) of many which were to follow, left universities short of 10% of their expected incomes (Stevens op.cit: 31). From this point, UK universities were to be engaged in a struggle for resources which remains as problematical today as it was then.

Three years later, in a further budget measure, international students, most of whom were from the Commonwealth, lost the equal fee status (equal with home students) that they had enjoyed since 1919 (when the UGC was established); fees for these students began to escalate from this time (1976), as did the special interest which institutions developed in this group. Clearly this was an important point in the special relationship which evolved between international students and HE in the UK. It is interesting that the issue surrounding international students and fees did not have its origin in policy, but was contingent upon a financial crisis.

A further three years later, in 1979, at the nadir of Britain's economic woes, the IMF demanded that as part of a package of fiscal assistance, the government should cease subsidising overseas students altogether; the treasury accepted. 1979 was also the year that a new government took office, a government which was fully in tune with the neo-

liberal project examined in an earlier chapter of this study. The 25% reduction in funding which was imposed on all universities in 1981 (Intensive interview with Batty, 2008) reflected both the depth of the government's fiscal difficulties and their attitude to public spending in general. Reductions of these magnitudes highlighted the fact that income streams to UK universities were almost entirely from the government: the sector had not developed revenues from students or from alumni groups as was the case elsewhere.

Paradoxically, the Thatcher government did not attempt to 'liberalise' the HE system in the way that it liberalised other domestic 'markets'. In a rare assessment that links the HE systems of China and the UK, Stevens posits that Mrs Thatcher's conservative government not only further curbed the independence of the universities, but also "set up a system of central control worthy of India, Cuba, Russia or China at their most extreme stage of central planning" (Stevens op.cit: 34). The 1980s saw an advance of monitoring and assessment and controls which we associate with New Public Management.

This notion of the 'nationalisation' of HE in the UK during the final two decades of the twentieth century is one which emerges from the literature; it was an incremental process traced by scholars such as Scott (Scott 2001:185-189). The words of Lord Baker, Education Secretary in the mid 1980s, not only provide an insight into that condition, but also reveal the vision which at that time seemed so difficult to achieve:

> "Our universities are, in fact, a nationalised industry. It is an under-funded mass system with... top down regulation... incessant bureaucratic regulation, trivial intervention... and under - investment... Universities started as private institutions and should become private institutions once again... they should be independent, free standing bodies, totally in charge of their own affairs" (Hansard, House of Lords, 2000, cited in Stevens 2004 op.cit:86).

The controls implicit in the paragraph above had some of their origins in the Jarratt report (Jarrat 1985), which recommended an improved system of monitoring what UK universities did, and how that could be assessed (Lucas 2006: 32), though it should be noted that the UGC had introduced a general 'assessment exercise' in 1981; the results were used to selectively distribute resources to universities. By 1986, this had become a 'Research Assessment Exercise' (RAE), and from this point we can observe the tightening of resource distribution towards those institutions with the greatest research

power. Between 1986 and 2001, there have been five RAEs in the UK, all aimed at assessing the quality of research at UK universities, based on the judgement of academic peers[18].

That the government of the day should impose such controls that it did is, of course, paradoxical, since the same government was committed to the idea of bringing "HE closer to the world of business" (HMSO 1987). During the whole of this era, the political debates (with regard to HE) raged around the issues of raising standards, value for money, accountability, introducing management cultures[19], raising participation rates, access by poorer students, what to do about the polytechnics, and of particular importance in the context of this study, the issue of stratification; there seemed to be a uniquely British paranoia surrounding the idea of differentiation in institutional quality (Warner and Palfreyman op.cit: 4).

5.2.5 The Post-1992 Era

I would argue that we can separate this period as that which cements the 'industrialisation of the research activity', a term used by one of my respondents to describe governance changes from 'research as a cottage industry' to a situation where central policy levers controlled the sector. The 1992 'version' of the RAE further refined the process to allow selective allocation of funds, and a number of quangos were set up to carry out the functions of the UGC which had been abolished in 1989. The UGC had been set up at arm's length from the government; the systems that replaced it were levers of government.

The 1992 RAE was established in the same year as the transfer of the polytechnics into the university system: all universities were included in the RAE system. Funding designations now included 'for research' and 'for teaching' elements; 90% of the funding for research was directed to Quality Research (QR), as assessed by a panel of academics. The system was further refined in later RAEs, in order to take account of

---

[18] See Lucas 2006: 33-34 for a detailed account of the changes to the RAE

[19] See, for example, The Dearing Report, HMSO 1997

technical responses from universities and to target more closely research which was deemed to be of a high quality (Lucas op.cit: 33-34). The reaction of twenty research-intensive universities and their formation into a pressure group (The Russell Group of Universities) has had the effect of further focusing research funding.

The range of quangos which replaced the functions of the UGC included the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)[20] and its corresponding councils in Wales (WHEFC) and Scotland (SHEFC). Styles posits that the HEFCE's funding methods have evolved during the two and a half decades since their formation to reflect government aims of expanding student places, reducing unit costs, increasing equity, access and competition and improving teaching and research quality (Stiles 2002). There are seven further funding quangos including the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC); some of these research councils have roots in the Robbins Report. Examples of other agencies and offices include the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), which was established in 1997, charged with auditing the way in which universities and colleges maintain the standards of their provision, and the Office for Fair Access (OFFA), charged with promoting wider participation in HE.

UK universities have had to respond to this new governance regime. They are still theoretically autonomous bodies, but Lucas argues that the similarity of their responses demonstrates that they have had very little room for manoeuvre (Lucas op.cit: 29-52). Others argue that in today's environment, "appropriate or favourable governance models" are needed if an institution is to be successful (Samil 2008: 27-34), but that model appears to be rather uniformly 'corporate', managerial and competitive, and one where power naturally drifts towards the centre.

HE in the UK must also be seen in the context of a wider EU approach, ever since 1973 when the UK joined what was then referred to as the Common Market. EU nations are

---

[20] HEFCE defines its responsibilities thus: to promote and fund high quality, cost-effective teaching and research, meeting the needs of students, the economy and society. Source: http://www.hefce.ac.uk

currently signed up to the Lisbon goal[21] which seeks that the EU should become "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, by promoting the role of our universities as international hubs for learning and research" (DfES 2004: 7). The Lisbon goals appear to be entirely consistent with national HE policy in the UK. The 2004 document issued by the Department for Education and Skills[22] entitled "Putting the World into World Class Education" (ibid) provides a summary of the view from the UK government regarding its aspirations for HE in the future. We might focus on these key points:

- "The research base is critical to the UK's future competitiveness"
- "The aim is to make Britain one of the most competitive locations in the world for science, research and innovation [in order to] attract more business, research and development investment"
- "Promoting the role of universities as international hubs for learning" (ibid: 8)

In terms of a macro-economic context, it is clear why the UK should seek a vigorous knowledge-based economy for the twenty-first century. The developed economies have lost advantage, in terms of labour costs, to the developing world. To sustain their standards of living, it is widely argued, developed nations must stay ahead in the technology race.

The second focus of the document above refers to attracting overseas students to UK higher (and further) education institutions; it has been of such political importance that in 1999 it became a cause for the Prime Minister of the day, Tony Blair, and was officially known as 'The Prime Minister's Initiative' (PMI)[23]. Interestingly, the PMI is not referred to as a policy, which perhaps requires a rationale, but as a set of targets. At

---

[21] The Lisbon Treaty of 2000 confirmed and extended the Bologna Process. In June 1999 in Bologna, Education Ministers from the UK and other European countries signed a declaration with the objective of progressing towards greater comparability of qualifications, more effective arrangements for Europe-wide credit transfer and quality assurance, and of promoting increased mobility.

[22] Since July 2007, the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills.

[23] For a full description of the PMI, see paragraph 54 of "Putting the World into World Class Education" DfES 2004

the time of writing, this policy remains extant. The historical development of the differentials in fees for overseas students was traced in this initiative. In an interview with the Chief Executive of UKCOSA (UK Council of Overseas Students' Affairs), I was assured that the motives for the PMI went far beyond the 'cash cow' notion; at the very top of government, motivation can afford to be 'fuzzy', and included the long-term wish to develop 'warm relationships' in an Asia which is soon expected to be the major global centre for research and development, and to have some of the largest GDPs (Scott 2007).

There is, of course, a link between research and postgraduate education in general and overseas students in HE institutions in the UK, which it would be pertinent to examine here. Seeking an overview of postgraduate education, Taylor points to the growth in this sector of HE in the UK, with numbers standing at just over 40,000 in the 1999-2000 academic year: an increase of about 20% from five years previously (Taylor 2002: 54). Sastry's data confirms this pattern: he reports a 21% increase over the years 1995-1996 to 2002-2003 (Sastry 2004:19) and reveals the significance of the taught Masters course in this growth - the sector shows a 42% growth rate over the same period[24].

Analysing the data with reference to overseas students, their importance can be seen. "The story of postgraduate education in the UK in the late 1990s and early 2000s is in large measure the story of the expansion of taught Masters courses" (Sastry op.cit: 19). Increasingly, overseas students from outside the EU dominate this growing sector, where they are very concentrated (Sastry op.cit:15): 48% of students on full-time Masters courses were in this category. As noted before, there is a special interest in this segment of the student population as a generator of 'flexible' income for each institution.

As the twentieth century came to a close, there were increasing references in the literature to the notion of the independence of universities and to the notion of the position of UK institutions as 'world ranking'; indeed, there seemed to be a real concern that if UK universities *had* a competitive edge, then that edge was becoming very dull.

---

[24] A warning should be given here: some of the data cited refers only to England, and most of the data referring to students refers to overseas students in general. However, the data may be taken as indicative.

And from 2003, according to Secretary Clarke's White Paper, "the thrust of government policy towards universities for the last 50 years was in the process of being significantly reversed" (Stevens op.cit:126); the changes, which increased the financial contribution from students, were enacted in the Education Act of the following year (Office of Public Sector Information 2004). Most commentators agree that though the funding crisis eased in the era of the New Labour government from 1997 onwards, limited resources still threaten UK HE's competitive edge in the new global era (Intensive interviews with Mok, UKR7, and UKR2). Many see under-funding as the main factor which threatens these achievements; despite the efforts to generate alternative income streams through fees and donations, in 2009 the government still provided 69% of the funding for HE in the UK (BBC 2008).

The last two decades of the century may not have provided the solutions to these issues, but they were nevertheless remarkable. By 2000, the number of students attending university had doubled again (Scott op.cit: 192); the amount paid by the government per student had halved; faculty to student ratio had halved to 1:17; and the expectation of attending university was at an all-time high.

With the above macro-contexts in mind, we now turn to a consideration of the case study institution, and the data collected from that institution.

5.2.6 Institution and Faculty Background

Philanthropy allowed the interest in higher learning to bear fruit at the IoUK, as it did in many cities in the UK in the Victorian and Edwardian eras. As in the PRC and Hong Kong, the names of these sponsors are evident in the physical infrastructure of the IoUK. From a number of separate colleges in the area, the university emerged in 1909 with its Royal Charter and is "a self-governing charity incorporated with legal status" (UKR1). The IoUK is a member of the previously mentioned Russell Group, which represents the interests of twenty prestigious UK universities. The IoUK is currently in 8th place in the 2008 UK leagues tables, and in 34th place in the 2009 global rank from the same publisher (THES 2009).

The governance structure of the IoUK reflects the traditional nomenclature of universities in the UK. A Vice-Chancellor is supported by "a Senate, the academic governing body which has to give formal approval of policy changes which are to do with academic matters, and a Council, the other governing body which deals with matters like staffing" (UKR3). The IoUK currently has 17,500 students, 5,000 of whom are postgraduates. There has been significant growth over the last 40 years: in 1970, the total number of students was just over 6,200.

The Faculty of Social Sciences and Law (henceforth referred to as Faculty of Social Sciences) is one of the largest faculties in the university with around 2,200 undergraduates, 2,300 postgraduates, and 300 academic and research staff: there are five Schools, two Departments and an Institute based in the faculty. The Schools are the Graduate School of Education, School of Policy Studies, School of Applied Community and Health Studies, School of Economics, Finance and Management and School of Law (The IoUK website, October 2009).

In the following sections of this chapter, the data from IoUK is presented and analysed.

5.3 Research Findings: the Faculty within the Wider Environment

5.3.1 A Context of Competition

Resonating with the literature regarding the 'competition nation', many respondents at the IoUK used the language of the market place and made reference to competition, as revealed by a Dean, and former Dean, of the Faculty of Social Sciences:

> "... in the global world, each university has to be a global player. Your client base must be global" (UKR3).

> "We have to try to make people think intuitively in global terms. We have to, and we should want to" (UKR1).

This represented a change from two or three decades ago, with consequent changes to governance and atmosphere, as suggested by a Pro-Vice Chancellor of the IoUK2:

> "So in the 1970s, it was a comfortable, sort of secure and safe environment to be working... not competitive. The only competition was between one academic and another for promotion; whereas now, HE is as competitive as any other business. And a Vice-Chancellor is as much a CEO (Chief Executive Officer) as he is a leader of an academic community. So one might have lost some of the collegiality but there is a much greater degree of elevation and activity and buzz around these days" (UKR4).

The respondents differentiated the segments of the market into domestic and international students, and graduates and undergraduates. The Dean elect told me that she knew a great deal about some of the 'markets':

> "...So esteem matters... and there is a difference there, in terms of what matters to particular students... for undergraduates, we are engaged in a national competition... we know that market quite well, you know, NSS (National Student Survey) rankings, UCAS forms, RAE data... and we have a lot of information about our competitors. On the other hand, our Masters market is wholly different... there, we are attracting 40% of overseas students... they are a much more mobile market... and we are also competing with some of the best programmes internationally" (UKR2).

Pricing was also a factor in the competition with other UK universities:

> "For our Masters course, we look first at the UK...because many of our international students are looking at a UK experience...so fees have to match directly (with other UK providers). What our international competitors are doing influences us less because of the context, you see, it could be a two year programme" (UKR 2).

There were other parts of the 'market', such as international students, which were less well understood. The sophistication with regard to segmentation did not appear to extend into marketing activities:

> "Honestly, I don't think we've done any marketing of any really robust nature. I don't think that within the department or indeed within the university, there has been anything very sustained. We've got good data looking through the rear view mirror at who has applied, who turns up etc... but less information about looking through the windscreen and thinking about the future market" (UKR2).

5.3.2 A Context of Organisational Change

Organisational change at the IoUK suggested a move towards centralisation and a continued search for a governance model which would best reflect changing circumstances. My respondents were keen to discuss the context of that change: the PVC from the IoUK2 told me that the new context in which UK universities found themselves required both organisational and cultural shifts:

> "...if you look at the structures of the university in the 1970s, you can sort of trace them back to the Middle Ages almost, but it's not so much the structures as the culture that goes on within them. So there's always been a vice chancellor running this university, but the kinds of imperatives driving vice chancellors in the 21st century are very different... Those imperatives would include: 'If you don't change and you don't grow, you are going to decline'. Whereas in the 1970s, it was 'Well we're doing alright so why do we want to change?'"(UKR4)

A previous Dean at the IoUK pointed out the significance of resources:

> "There are people who prefer to see the world as it was rather than as it is; perhaps some academics are a bit naive, but they still want their salaries paid at the end of every month; we do need to generate diverse income streams" (UKR3).

There was a consensus that, in the recent past, a centralisation of decision making had taken place at the IoUK. This respondent, a lecturer in mid-career, spoke with some bitterness about what he felt was a gradual loss of influence of faculty staff:

> "We are in an environment of constant organisational change, where it is assumed that smaller units are not able to function, though there is no evidence for this. There is an incremental corporatisation, where all changes favour the centre in terms of power. There is still a semblance of democracy, but a diminishing agenda on that which is consulted" (UKR5).

Other respondents recognised the changes but spoke with a greater measure of acceptance:

> "Senate and Council are more like rubber stamps; the real decisions are made by a small senior management team" (UKR3).

The organisational tensions between the departments, schools, and faculties also emerged in the interviews:

> "I think that one of the IoUK's problems is that everything is left to the department, nothing is done at faculty level. This makes sense in a way because Economics students, for example, have very different needs from Sociology students. But I do think that there should be some generic stuff that should be handled across the university" (UKR3).

And yet, at the time I was present at the IoUK, the move to larger units was continuing. The three departments of the Faculty of Social Science which had thus far remained independent were engaged in the process of corporatisation; across the road, in the Faculty of Arts, all postgraduate activities were being re-organised into a new Graduate School. An informant commented on the 'schoolification' process:

> "Those departments may be unlikely bed fellows, but it allows a more flexible platform administratively, for example, for the delivery of PhD programmes…we can only get funding from the ESRC if we are of a certain scale" (UKR6).

There were unresolved issues further up the chain of responsibilities: the Dean informed me of the debates which were likely to result in changes in the future:

> "The roles of PVCs have changed and they have emerged as having much broader thematic responsibilities, spanning, for example, research; and therefore they assume a responsibility for operational questions across all faculties. So these two models… the PVC and the Dean… are coinciding or colliding, so the lineal responsibilities of Deans are clashing with vertical responsibilities of the PVCs, mixing with the traditional role of the PVC as having oversight of a faculty, put that together and you have a potential disjuncture. So in my view, either the role of the Dean or the PVC should go… perhaps the Dean should be replaced with super College Heads … you know, some UK universities now have 12-15 colleges, smaller units, reporting to the centre… (UKR1).

5.3.3 A Context of League Tables

In my interviews with staff at the IoUK, the significance of, and the issues surrounding league tables emerged. There was a consensus that national and global positioning were linked. That league tables should be treated with caution was noted by the Dean elect:

> " The Vice Chancellor takes the view, which I think is sound, that there are so many league tables and there is so much politics around league tables, that it is not a wise strategy to start celebrating your position in league tables as a key indicator of your own strength because you are vulnerable to going up and down… and you're vulnerable to someone else's agenda and ranking and I do think it's a better strategy just to say what your own strengths are, and evidence that, and let people make their own judgements." (UKR 2)

However, there was also recognition that the reputation or esteem afforded by such devices was important to the well-being of the institution. This from a PVC of a similarly-ranked institution (IoUK2):

> "We want to be a top 10/20 university in the UK but you can't without being in the top 100 in the world. So internationalisation is essential; it runs through all activities: educational and research portfolios and particularly in relation to external relations" (UKR4).

The Dean at the IoUK suggested that there was something special about the current time with regard to these league tables. He suggested that the Shanghai rank had particular importance for the IoUK and that league tables in general were now linked to income:

> "We are at a cross roads... international league tables are taking on a higher profile... the Shanghai Jioatong... this is the one which everyone pays most attention to... it's increasingly the bench mark indicator. And there are funding reasons why it is important. An increasing number of governments will only sponsor students who come to universities at a given point on those league tables. So position on the league tables is not just 'ego' but is driven by revenue streams..." (UKR1).

The Dean elect saw a future where global league tables would take on greater significance:

> "Building your international reputation has got more important, and will get even more important. Ten years ago, it may have been alright to aspire to be strong nationally, but nobody would employ that strategy now. Rhetorically, to do well in your national league tables, you have got to be international, and so rhetorically it has become hugely important, and in the next five years it's going to have to be mainstreamed into everything we do... what has emerged is the importance of internationalism... it has come up the agenda..."(UKR 2)

The analysis now moves away from the wider contexts towards a focus on governance within the Faculty at IoUK.

5.4 Research findings: Practice within the Faculty

5.4.1 The Role of the Dean

The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the IoUK was appointed to the role in 2006. His appointment represented a change from the previous system of election:

> "One applies for the position. Candidates are elicited. But essentially the appointment is made by the senior management team... it's not an election, as was previously so..." (UKR1).

He saw his role as that of being a bridge between faculty staff and the university, and stressed the financial and strategic responsibilities:

> "The Dean's role straddles the academic, the organisational, and the financial. I take the concerns of the faculty to the university, and take the decisions of the broader university and attempt to implement them at and within the faculty, so I am often seen by both sides as the creature of the other and am usually disowned by both (smiling). My job is really about money and people. I try to ensure people are properly resourced and the faculty operates within budget. My job is to set the general tone or trajectory of the faculty, so I try not to intervene in departmental matters. It's more a role of strategic direction rather than operational" (UKR1).

The Dean's own description of his duties seemed to omit some elements where he came into contact with faculty staff. My study of the IoUK coincided with a difficult time for the institution: a period of financial contraction. This situation had the effect of highlighting the various roles of the Dean. I cite three examples here.

Firstly, I had the opportunity to speak to a Centre Director who was in shock following an encounter with the Dean, an encounter which revealed the lengths to which the Dean was prepared to go to fulfil his financial responsibilities. The Director had been persuaded by the Dean to relinquish his post and move to a Chair in another Department: this move alleviated the financial embarrassment of the faculty:

> "The governance model here is extra-ordinary! There should be a global search for these posts...that is what has happened at all the other universities I have worked in. I was put in a very difficult position..." (UKR6).

Secondly, I was given sight of a letter from the Dean encouraging departments to better perform. The letter cited disappointments in NSS scores and listed the concerns of students, such as feedback and the slow return of essays: this will be examined further in a later section. What is significant here is that the Dean saw his role as protector of the faculty's esteem:

> "This is obviously a situation which we must not let continue. If we did, it would damage the faculty: as it is, it is lowering the IoUK's position in the league tables, and arousing adverse comments in other parts of the university..." (UKR1).

In a further letter, the Dean challenged programme directors to aim high:

> "We should be asking, if this programme is not ranked in the top ten, why is it not, and what needs to be done to get it there, so to match the other excellent work of the faculty" (UKR1).

And finally, I was told by faculty staff that in the period of financial difficulty, it was the Dean who had the responsibility to terminate contracts, and several staff had in fact been 'let go':

> "The Dean has the power to make me redundant" (UKR5).

5.4.2 The Significance of, and Strategies for Building a Reputation

At the IoUK, maintaining and enhancing a strong reputation was reported as of great significance and something that had evolved recently; a number of clear strategies towards this purpose emerged.

> "Reputation building is a deliberate strategy. The IoUK is not well-known internationally... I call it reputation propagation... we have not been good at it in the past" (UKR1).

> "It (reputation-building) couldn't be much more significant! We've decided to mainstream this into everything we do, I think that's right" (UKR2).

The Dean's words above were affirmed by the IoUK website statement regarding the current strategic priorities:

> "Priority 1: Be recognised globally for the quality of our research. Research of the highest standard... is central to the growth of the university's global reputation..." (The IoUK website, October 2009).

A strategic goal of the IoUK2 mirrors this statement, with all other goals and strategies dovetailing with this key aim:

> "Strategic Goal 3: To promote actively a strong international reputation for the IoUK2..." (The IoUK2 website, October 2009).

The Dean elect associated a strong reputation with maintaining income streams for research and fees from international students:

> "Reputation is absolutely key. Students want to apply to somewhere with prestige... particularly international students, want to come somewhere which is top ten rank... and... a lot of governments who are funding those students stipulate that, so they only find students who are going to five star institutions (referring to RAE assessments). So I have to respond to that...And in terms of getting the research grant income...you can't afford not to be seen to be a very strong research institution. It's central to the game" (UKR2).

She also associated a strong reputation with change:

"... because maintaining success involves having new and ambitious goals" (UKR2)

Strategies to promote the reputation of the faculty were integral to its aims, and included offering salaries commensurate with academic esteem, working with Alumni groups, targeted publishing (more details in the following section), and the appointment in 2009 of a marketing officer (exclusively promoting the faculty):

> "In principle, salary differentials are not an issue, and salaries are quite good. The bigger issue is providing what they want when they get here" (UKR1).
>
> "Another strategy is to work with Alumni groups in various parts of the world" (UKR1).
>
> "The faculty has had to get better at advertising itself as a whole. So we need to get someone in place who could go out there and develop a cross-faculty approach, which we can use to market the faculty... its too fragmented at the moment" (UKR1).
>
> "... so the postgraduate market is very important for our faculty: it makes sense to invest in international marketing expertise at faculty level" (UKR2).

Physical resources were also seen as crucial to this enterprise. The Dean informed me that he had overseen (with others) a number of building projects:

> "I'm sure the Library was not doing us any favours with regard to student evaluation! Both our new 'social space' areas are really about improving the feel-good factor around the faculty...it's the kind of decision which is about judgement... I have no regrets about it, you know, the resources we deployed... it says something about the type of experience that you want to deliver for the students... And we still need to improve conference facilities..." (UKR1).

At the IoUK2, strategies to build reputation included creating a welcoming environment for all non-UK students, building opportunities for staff visits and exchanges with key HEIs in target countries, and 'piggy backing' on the reputation of others:

> "We will work with international organizations and key regional organizations with global reach such as the Eden Project, the Met Office, and Airbus to develop research and life-long learning partnerships with their international partners" (IoUK2 website, October 2009).

5.4.3 The Research Culture

"Develop(ing) our portfolio of flagship and high-impact research" is a stated strategic priority of the IoUK (the IoUK website, October 2009). We have already noted in the section above how a flexible salary structure is used in order to attract researchers of high esteem to the faculty; the use of high-impact publishing destinations was also mentioned. Regarding the latter, the Dean elect stated the current imperative:

> "... in fact, to be internationally recognised means to be recognised in the US, to be published in US journals. You have to publish in the top-ranking journals and most of those are American" (UKR2).

She explained how researchers were encouraged to publish:

> "We have a Research Management Team that meets with everybody, individually, one on one, every term, to review their research strategy, including where they are planning to send their articles to, which publisher they would go to with their monograph, which funding councils they would go to with their grant applications, and we would offer advice and guidance on that, so if a new colleague said he was working on an article to go to Millennium, we might say, why not work on it for another six months and send it to International Organisations..." (UKR2).

The Dean was keen to point out that any reputational advantage that stemmed from research activity was a by-product of that activity:

> "Reputation would be a second-order outcome rather than a primary goal. Few people would embark upon a project merely because it was prestigious or give greater visibility" (UKR1).

The Dean was also keen to point out the international nature of much of the research that took place in the faculty, and to encourage the continuance of this practice:

> "We have to try to make people think intuitively in global terms. We have to, and we should want to. Research agendas are increasingly international and global agendas, you have to have these broader set of interactions, many of the issues we face are globalised issues..." (UKR1).

This faculty approach was linked to the IoUK's attempts to establish a strategic direction regarding research, with identified geographical foci:

> "We will... think strategically about broader relationships with particular countries and sub-regions, focusing particularly on North America, Europe and the Far East" (The IoUK website, October 2009).

Interestingly, the IoUK2 had also identified areas where collaborations would be sought, though the geographical areas were different from those selected by the IoUK. The Dean summarised neatly the causes and consequences of this approach to research:

> "... the consequence of the industrialisation of research funding has meant that research has now just *got to be* a more managed enterprise..." (UKR1).

In the year I was conducting interviews at the IoUK (2009), research themes were also being identified. It was envisaged that some of this targeted research would be inter-disciplinary. Of the twenty-nine research themes identified, themes for the Faculty of Social Sciences included Ethnicity, Gender, Human Rights and Security and Governance:

> "The development and nurturing of our portfolio of University Research Themes and their leaders will be a key priority and we will actively seek new themes focusing on major areas of research. We will promote the Institute X (named) as a vehicle to host and support a range of multidisciplinary activities... (many of these) themes cut across departmental and faculty boundaries and reflect the reality of doing research in a fast-moving environment...." (The IoUK website, October 2009).

There appeared to be contradictory messages about multidisciplinary research. I was privileged to attend a seminar presented by the Dean elect where she described inter-disciplinary research as a model of organisational restructuring, allowing a response to the challenges of our times, and as a strategy which allowed the faculties which chose to involve themselves to keep ahead in the competition that is HE. However, there were other pressures which acted against such re-organisation:

> "It's going to get more and more intense with the Research Excellence Framework (REF)[25], which is going to look at citations and which journals you go in and how often you cite, so it's going to be a very targeted research strategy from now on and making sure people publish very carefully in the right places. And an increasing disciplinarity because each panel has its own ranking, indicating which journals really matter and so publishing in the inter-disciplinary journals is always going to be a risky strategy" (UKR2).

5.4.4 Internationalisation and Stratification

The Faculty of Social Science at the IoUK has a strong international flavour, in that 48% of the international students at the university study within the faculty. However, the presence of international students did not, in the view of my respondents, represent an end to the process of internationalisation at the institution. I was told that there was limited international curricular content, no training in cultural awareness for staff, and limited interest in exchanges and language development. The Dean felt that a cultural shift was necessary:

> "Once upon a time, the prestige of a university flowed out of the prestige of the country in which it was sited...the UK was prestigious so the universities were prestigious. There is a glimmer of that still...but that in itself is not going to be sufficient anymore, in the light of international league tables...now in order that you should maintain that prestige you have to be genuinely internationally sited. So for the IoUK it is no longer a case of others looking in, we have to be looking out...and this does involve a culture shift for some of us..."(UKR1).

The IoUK2's statement on internationalisation also noted the link between collaboration and esteem:

> "Over the next few years our ability to build and maintain international partnerships will increasingly be used as an indicator of our excellence and strong reputation. The Corporate Plan highlights the importance of international research esteem indicators..." (The IoUK2, Internationalisation Strategy Document, 2006).

---

[25] The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the new system for assessing the quality of research in UK HEIs. In previous years, research quality has been assessed periodically through the RAE. The first REF exercise is due to be completed in 2013. Source: http://www.hefce.ac.uk

The IoUK's 'Vision & Strategy' document specifies that "We are committed to seeking further collaborative...partnerships with leading overseas institutions". There is an intention to develop a comprehensive database of the university's current international research collaborations and to think strategically about how to develop those collaborations. However, at the time of the research, most collaboration took place at the level of the Department, Centre, or the individual: there were no faculty-led collaborations: such collaboration had been mooted in 2002, but this had not materialised. The nature of collaboration has meant a wide range of international institutions are engaged with the IoUK.

The major exception to this Department-, Centre-, or the individual-led collaboration is the Institution's engagement with the World Universities Network (WUN), a global partnership of research intensive universities 'committed to working together to support research and education in areas of global significance' (http://www.wun.ac.uk). Such a partnership naturally implies a deliberate stratification, a joining together of institutions of similar prestige, as does the statement below form the Vice Chancellor of the IoUK:

> "Often, high quality research is concentrated in only a few major universities and national institutes...There is much talk of creating "world-class" universities from scratch within ten years in various parts of the world. Most commentators would argue that a university can only be considered "world-class" when it has demonstrated world-class output in its students and in its knowledge generation over a period of decades. These considerations should be taken into account when contemplating a new international partner" (The IoUK website, October 2009).

The statement above suggests that in future, IoUK managers may take a greater interest in its international partners, and may prefer those with an erstwhile pedigree.

5.4.5 Teaching, Student Feedback and a Client-based Culture

There appeared to be a shift in the culture of teaching at the IoUK which was more responsive to student opinion than in the recent past. Three of my respondents used terms such as 'client' or 'market' when referring to student bodies. The DVC of the IoUK2 made reference to the fee-paying environment which has developed over the last ten years, which he suggested had changed the relationship between teacher and student:

> "Well, I guess there were fewer pressures (in the 1970s); for a start students weren't paying fees the way they are now, so there wasn't the *customer component* of the issue" (UKR4).

The Dean at the IoUK resisted this view:

> "I've always been reluctant to treat students in this consumerist paradigm...I don't see it as a reflection of the type of relationship we should want..." (UKR1).

Nevertheless, student opinion appeared to have the power to cause anxiety, as mentioned in a section above. The Dean elect told me that recent NSS surveys had not been favourable with regard to certain undergraduate courses in the faculty, and she said that she would urge the relevant staff to act in ways which would elicit more favourable responses from students in the future. The Dean held the view that student opinion was becoming 'volatile' and 'difficult to manage' in the current era of instant electronic communication:

> "... the part you are not in control of, is what happens in real time...what counts is that if your students are having a miserable time in February, they are only a keyboard away from complaining, and are more than happy to share their experiences... your perspective students will hear about it. In that way, social networking is far more important than the faculty website, that is just a given... reputationally, the 'Facebook phenomenon' is far more significant, because their entire conversation is taking place in real time..." (UKR1).

I was shown letter from a Dean at IoUK to faculty staff which confirmed that student evaluation was having an impact on practice regarding postgraduate researchers. The letter, written in October 2009, quoted a HEA survey which suggested that aspects of PhD training had been heavily criticized and that there was particular satisfaction with such issues as the frequency of meetings with supervisors, preparation for the upgrade process, and the like. The letter instructed supervisory staff to carry out a number of improvements if their current practice was not up to standard: for example, supervisors were told to 'agree a schedule of meetings' with their research students.

Some administrative staff in the faculty, who came into contact with students, had been invited to attend courses related to 'customer care', a further example of the 'customer component' referred to earlier. During the training course, they were encouraged to think specifically about how they engaged with students and that appropriate engagement involved respect for and understanding of the students' position. When I asked the Dean about these courses, he told me that he did not know who had organised them, and that presumably it was an initiative of the Administration Office.

5.4.6 Concluding Comments

This chapter has traced the development of universities in the UK and has focused particularly on governance changes over the last two or three decades. During those decades, a deliberate policy shift has taken place away from 'managing the system (at the level of the institution) on the basis of academic judgement' (Shattock 1994: 152) towards a centralised system where resources are managed through a number of quangos which operate on the basis of performatives.

In my interviews, many respondents at the IoUK used the language of the market place and made reference to competition for students and staff, at a national and an international level. They suggested that there was, and had been, a move towards centralisation and a continued search for a governance model which would best reflect changing circumstances; it appeared that in this regard, there had been a change in culture. A number of issues surrounding league tables were mentioned, but there was plenty of evidence that staff were engaged with the struggle to maintain positioning in these tables, prompted by the promise of resources.

The position of Dean is held not through faculty elections, as was the case until 1998, but is an appointment. The Dean at the IoUK exercised a number of roles but his duties to balance the faculty budget came to the fore in the rather difficult fiscal period of my study. With regard to encouraging greater visibility and esteem for the faculty, the Dean was involved in a number of strategies, such as the recent appointment of marketing personnel. Research was at the centre of reputation building for the faculty, and a number of faculty themes had recently been identified. Regarding internationalisation, my respondents were aware that the focus had been to attract international students, and that changes were still necessary in, for example, curriculum design; there appeared to be moves from senior management to ensure that future collaboration took place with 'suitable' partners. The relationship between staff and students appeared to be changing: there was evidence that student evaluation was being used to change practice in the faculty.

Chapter 6. The Institute of China: Contexts and Findings

This chapter examines the context in which the IoC developed, and the findings from the empirical part of the study.

6.1 Introduction

The People's Republic of China occupies much of the land mass of eastern Asia, and at 9 million square kilometres it is one of the largest nations on the planet. China has the largest population of any nation at 1.3 billion, and significantly for this study, it also has the largest HE system. With a history that can be traced back 5,000 years, it is also one of the oldest civilisations, and its oldest schools were established 3,000 years ago. During China's long dynastic history, the practice of education developed with distinctly Chinese characteristics, and is was not until the contact with Western colonial powers in the nineteenth century that a recognisably modern education system began to be developed.

The Treaty of Nanjing in 1842 marks the beginning of a painful re-shaping of the Chinese nation, and there followed a century of conflict which was to re-fashion the political, economic, social and technological landscapes. In 1949, the Chinese Communist Party emerged as the undisputed political leaders of the nation, and this has remained so until the present day. For the first decades of the new nation, the Cold War brought about a distancing from the West, and a developing mistrust between Russia and China during the 1960s contributed to China's isolation; the Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s and early 1970s exacerbated that isolation. 1979 heralded the era of 'reform', when China entered into regional and global engagement and embraced capital as a partial solution to its economic problems.

In order to understand current developments in HE on the mainland, we have to be aware of the contexts as outlined above and to recognise a number of factors. Firstly, current developments must be seen as part of the erstwhile continuum of China's interest in higher learning. Secondly, we should take China's periods of isolation into

account, both the long-term isolation through historic time and the self-imposed isolation during some of the latter part of the twentieth century. Further, there is the political belief in central planning, which is fundamental to the operation of the national system. Nor should we forget the sheer size of both the nation and the HE system. Finally, we have to recognise the desire to enter the global economy, and to compete within that system.

6.2 The Development of HE: Political, Economic and Social Contexts

I suggest that using five time periods may provide a useful framework to view the different directions in which higher learning on the mainland has moved:

- Higher learning in dynastic China
- 1841-1911: that is, the latter years of the Qin Dynasty
- 1911-1949: that is, from the early days of the Republic (ROC), to the end of the civil war
- 1949-1976: the Mao era
- 1977 to the present day: that is, since the opening up to the West

6.2.1 Higher Learning in Dynastic China

Some have argued that the roots of HE in China are shallower than they are in the West, but that is a view that focuses only on the university as an institution, and ignores other leaning organisations. It is generally held that though traditional Confucianism extolled the virtues of education, it was education for a particular set of values[26]. There was an emphasis on the acceptance of moral values, on a cohesive, stable society[27], with an "excessive concern for human relations" (Wang, 1997: 7); self-examination and self-

---

[26] "Broadly, the object of education was two-fold: to imbue the pupil with a sense of right and wrong and to awaken in him a sense of mission towards the masses" (Wang, 1997: 9).

[27] Wang cites a number of writers whose work suggests that the scholar-administrator system enjoyed broad-based social and geographical appeal; not only was entry into the hierarchy allowed from all classes, but there was a quota system which involved all parts of the nation . He also makes the point that an individual village would often sponsor a local scholar in the hope of accruing benefits from a successful candidate (Wang 1966:3-37).

criticism were encouraged. Deprecated in this pedagogy were law, compulsion, technology and commerce.

Traditionally, a system of state-run schools was geared exclusively toward the imperial civil service examination. This examination, based on the tenets of Confucianism, was one of the routes allowing entry into the civil service, an examination which is judged to have required perseverance and prolonged study of the classics, and resulting in the scholar-administrators who shaped policy and practice in China for centuries. It was this position of the 'literati' which welded learning and governing together, within the same elite class.

Recent research (for example, by Wu 2005) has focused attention on the role of the ancient Chinese academies (*shu yuan*)[28], a parallel system of higher learning which operated independently of the establishment since the late Tang Dynasty (619–907 AD). These academies were private, local educational institutes, which are said to have attracted scholars from the entire Chinese Diaspora. They developed into a new educational system from the Song Dynasty (960–1279 AD), when their numbers and influence grew. In contrast to state-run schools, academies took the pursuit of true knowledge as the goal of education. Independence was a feature of these academies, as it was in early Western universities, (see Chapter 5), but the approach to knowledge was not a shared feature of East and West. Scholars suggest that it was the view of knowledge as a totality, always referenced to nature, which characterised traditional Chinese learning (Wu 2005), rather than the exhaustive examination of a particular aspect of reality; the latter is the approach which has since been adopted globally, and is, of course, the approach which is taken in this study.

However we view the traditional Chinese approach to learning, the formal system as a whole was regarded as being highly resistant to change, and though there are many individual instances of scientific enquiry in China, new knowledge did not prosper in

---

[28] There were 7000 of these independent academies, and they were often located in the central mountain regions of China. They were often assisted by disaffected literati from the establishment. Students were taught by 'masters': all were male; the observation of nature was very important in the curriculum, and many sessions were held outside in the gardens (Wu, op.cit)

the way which it did in the West (Wang 1997: 3-37). Thus, constrained by feudalism, Chinese HE in its present form evolved only after the trauma of the early part of the nineteenth century.

6.2.2 1841-1911

Only after 1842 and the advent of Western influence, did the ancient curriculum of the Chinese classics begin to crumble (Min 1997: 8). In their introduction to the reshaping of China since 1842 and the aforementioned Treaty of Nanjing, Teng and Fairbank assert that contact with the West was such that it "challenged, attacked, undermined and overwhelmed" the old order, including the old educational order (Teng & Fairbank 1954: 1). The Treaty marked a departure from the previous tribute relations between the Chinese Empire and the outside world, and heralded a century of turmoil in international relations, characterised by "unequal treaties".

Substantive educational change was viewed as being tied into wider social and institutional change, from the very beginning of this period. Wang observes that it was largely as a result of the efforts of scholars such as Li Hung-Chang, soon after the Treaty, that China commenced the adoption of Western learning, though initially that learning was aimed at acquiring military technology (Wang 1966: 41). A short citation from Li, renowned military commander and administrator as well as scholar, may help to illustrate the plethora of factors which were driving the perceived need for broad based institutional change:

> "If we remain conservative, without making any change, the nation will be daily reduced and weakened... Now all the foreign countries are having one reform after another, and progressing every day like the ascending of steam. Only China continues to preserve her traditional institutions so cautiously that even through she be ruined and extinguished" (Li Hung-Chang, cited in Teng & Fairbank, op.cit: 87)

Central to an analysis of Li's text is the concept that the nation was "reduced and weakened"; the remedy was "self-strengthening". This notion of "self-strengthening" appears to have emerged in the early 1860s (ibid: 51), thence entering the discourse where, one might argue, it remains until the present day. Feng Kuei-fen points to language as a key component in unlocking the wealth of knowledge regarding

mathematics, mechanics, optics and chemistry contained in the literature of the West (see Feng Kuei-fen, cited by Teng & Fairbank, op.cit: 51)

In the early 1860s, some of the reforms proposed were taking shape (for example, Wang 1966: 42). In Beijing, the Interpreters College was inaugurated in 1861, which included language and science tuition by Western professors. Similar colleges were set up in Shanghai, Guangzhou and Suzhou in 1863/64 (ibid: 75). Students were sent to the West for training: Wang, for example (op.cit:42), reports that 120 students received education in the US between 1872 and 1881. Interestingly, the Treaty which allowed this interchange, signed in 1868, can perhaps be interpreted as a forerunner of the current GATS agreement referred to in Chapter 2; the agreement allowed Chinese to enter US HEIs, and for American schools to be established in (restricted) parts of China, and for Chinese schools to operate in the U.S. (Teng and Fairbank op.cit: 91)! In fact, the official Education Mission lasted only a short time: in 1881 it was abandoned after much lobbying by conservatives. Nevertheless, by the final decade of the nineteenth century, we see the beginnings of a radical, domestic HE system:

> "The first modern institution, Peiyang University, was founded on October 2, 1895, in Tianjin. The university changed its name to Tianjin University in 1951 and became one of the leading universities in China. Next, Jiaotong University was founded in Shanghai in 1896." (Duan: op.cit).[29]

In 1897, Lin Qi, the governor of Hangzhou, established the Qiushi Academy: it is regarded as the parent of Zhejiang University. Lin is reported to have studied the Western system of HE and applied this within the Qiushi Academy (www.zju.edu.cn/english). Two things are significant here: that it was the Qing governor who established the school, and that a Western approach was adopted.

The expansion of HE under the Qing was cemented when China's penultimate emperor, Guang Shu, decreed in the early twentieth century that all the aforementioned academies (referred to in the previous section) should turn to the Western learning

---

[29] Duan observes the recent celebrations which marked the hundredth anniversaries of some of the leading institutions: "Tianjin University celebrated its hundredth anniversary in 1995, followed by Xi'an Jiaotong and Shanghai Jiaotong Universities in 1996. Other leading universities, such as Zhejiang University (1897), Beijing University (1898), and Nanjing University (1902) also recently celebrated their hundredth anniversaries, one after another." (Duan: op.cit).

tradition. Certainly some locations did heed this dictat: the Yuelu Academy, for example, was amalgamated into present day Hunan University (Wu, op.cit.).

One of the features of scholarly writing in this area is the increasing reference to Japan and the rush there for modernisation, as the nineteenth century merged with the twentieth century. In 1905, the aforementioned civil service examination system, established in AD 622, was abolished; it was replaced by a new educational model based on Western and Japanese models (Teng and Fairbank, op.cit: 205). By this same period, "education abroad, especially in Japan, had become highly esteemed. As many as 10,000 Chinese students were in Japan at any one time, whereas only a few went to Europe and the United States." (ibid: 206). A century later, the attraction of the Japanese university for Chinese students is still strong.

6.2.3 1911-1949

Sun Yi Xian (Sun Yat Sen) was the first President of the Republic, an icon of the new Chinese nationalism, though some say this nationalism was born out of national weakness rather than of national strength (Rodzinski 1979). Despite the internal problems which political division, parochialism, the clan and 'warlord-ism' brought to the new Republic, this was a nationalism which had ambition for China, an ambition which was reflected in its interest in developing HE.

Teng and Fairbank uphold this significance in the unfolding story of Chinese political radicalism: in his 1905 T'ung-meng Hui Manifesto, Sun Yi Xian raises the ideas of land redistribution and of transforming "the condition of the peasantry to that of literate, property-owning, economically independent, politically active citizens"; these transformative notions, which clearly include educational development, are not previously observed in their own document research (Teng & Fairbank op.cit: 224). In similar vein, it is interesting to observe the advance of internationalisation *of ideas* during the first two decades of the twentieth century, the era of Sun Yi Xian, in the context of this increasing radicalism. By 1919,T'sai Yuan P'ei's defence of freedom of academic thought for Beijing University seems a far cry from the strictures of the

Manchu court, and also emphasises the significance of Western culture in the curriculum at that time:

> "What is called a university is not merely a place for a majority of the students to attend classes on time and to be furnished with the qualifications for becoming graduates. It is actually an organization for academic research by professors and students working together...." (T'sai Yuan P'ei, cited in Teng and Fairbank op.cit: 238)

By this stage of the twentieth century, the perceived need for a national university system was without dispute. Development of HE proceeded apace, though it was limited by the political and economic confusion of the times; despite civil war and invasion and general instability, by 1949 China had 204 universities with an enrolment of one hundred and fifty thousand students (Min op cit: 38). These 204 universities were a mix of state-run, province-run, private, and a considerable number operated by missionaries (Mok 2006: 101).

6.2.1 1949-1976

The period chosen here represents the Mao era. This was a time which was blessed with some stability, though the absolute power wielded by Mao resulted in general terms in rapid and sometimes ill-considered policy changes: another feature of the era is that of relative international isolation. From this time, centralisation was a key feature of Chinese HE: in the newly nationalised system, all the previously-mentioned private and missionary universities were taken into the national framework, and funding was provided entirely by the state. This represented the epic communist vision of the state as monolithic institution, faithfully carrying out its function of reproducing the conditions required for production; as Mok suggests, " at that time, it was believed that a state control model could best serve the centrally planned economy in general and the national manpower needs in particular" (Mok 2006: 101). This concept of HE being linked to national economic planning is of course very important, and is a theme which will be returned to many times in this thesis. It is also important to note the manner and extent of the political control of the system since this time: not only do Party personnel remain actively involved (Zou 2007) at all levels of university life (as in many walks of Chinese life), but planning, even at faculty level, is subject to approval from Beijing (CR3).

The early part of the era was characterised by Soviet influence: ideology, proximity and China's needs briefly welded the two communist giants together in a raft of co-operation, from railways to urban planning. Following the Russian model, universities moved from being comprehensive and autonomous in nature, to being highly specialised and centrally managed: syllabi, textbooks and other course software were part of the central provision (Duan op.cit). The case study institution illustrates the pattern: it was split up into a number of single-discipline colleges during the 1952 readjustment of China's Tertiary Education System. The 'Great Leap Forward' of 1958 saw a dramatic explosion of HE, when more than a thousand universities and colleges were established within three years; reorganisation reduced this number to 407 in 1963[30]. The Cultural Revolution then arrested HE development until the late 1970s.

6.2.5 1977 - Present

The subject of this section is the "vigorous development" (Min op.cit: 39), associated with post-Mao economic development and the open-door policy, which continues today. The main thrust of reform has followed the Central Committee's declaration that an appropriate HE system, to include all disciplines, was to be fostered, at a scale commensurate with China's economic power (Ngok and Guo: 2007: 22). This policy has been associated with other processes, such as wide-ranging decentralisation, privatisation, restructuring and massification, alongside a search for non-government funding[31], as we have seen in Chapter 2.

In the context of this study, the move towards the development of *all* disciplines is significant. Prior to the mid-1990's, it is generally considered that the focus was on the

---

[30]Duan observes the effect of the re-organisation to the Soviet model: each reorganized university or institute offered many more majors in specific curricula than were available under the Western model. For example, the discipline of mechanical engineering was typically transformed into sub-disciplines to permit general mechanical engineering students to major in machine tools, casting, welding, or forging, while thermal power engineering majors could specialize in boilers, turbines, internal combustion engines, compressors, or refrigeration machinery (Duan op.cit.).

[31] Mok provides a thorough examination of the details of these changes (decentralisation, privatisation, and restructuring) in Chapter 5 of his text on Education Reform in East Asia (Mok 2006).

hard sciences; this appears to have shifted with national schemes such as, for example, the 'Programme for the Prosperity of Philosophy and the Social Sciences in HEIs' (announced by the MoE in 2003) (Zhou 2006: 131). Zhou also describes the measures designed to enhance teaching and learning in these areas under this programme, and points to the rationale: "they play an irreplaceable role in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects, and in the historical rejuvenation of the country" (ibid: 131, 132).

Part of that open-door policy was the turn away from the Soviet system and a return to the influence of WesternHE. The Soviet system was perceived to have a number of weaknesses: there were rigid administrative boundaries, a narrow curriculum range, and little communication between scholarship, industry and research (Zhou op.cit.). The reorganisation since the 1990s has seen the return of the comprehensive university, exhibiting a wide range of faculties. This has partly been achieved by mergers, such as with Zhejiang and Xi'an Jiaotong Universities, where, in each location, three HEIs were combined to form 'comprehensives' (Duan op.cit.). Clearly the shifting of direction from Western model to Soviet, and then back to the former, has been one of the factors that have hindered development of PRC's HE.

One of the features of this latest era in PRC HE is the engagement with the market. Zhou describes the new relationship (between HE and the market economy) thus:

> "Policy makers embraced the idea of giving prominence to optimisation of scale, structure, quality and efficiency, and valuing the role of the market in allocating resources" (Zhou 2006: 54).

A further feature is the presence of alternative sources of funding. In particular, the donation of considerable sums of money by wealthy entrepreneurs is evident on many campuses, and marks a return to an erstwhile tradition of philanthropy, particularly towards education. For example, at IoC, the case study institution, of the many benefactors who have assisted the university, four well known names stand out; Run Run Shaw has provided an academic building, Leung Kau Kui a performance hall,

Henry Fok the sports complex, and Tsang Hin Chi an administrative building (CR1)[32]. Such private monies have been flowing into universities since the early 1980s.

Returning to policy considerations, and bearing in mind the increasing global integration of the Chinese economy, the Chinese leadership has associated the nation's future with the growth of a high technology knowledge economy (Ngok and Guo: 21); in an anthem repeated across so many nations, international competitiveness is linked to educational development, technology and the degree of knowledge innovation (MoE 1998). Amongst the range of declarations in the early 1990s, of particular significance is the announcement of the '211 project', so called because it was introduced as a scheme which was aimed at transforming about 100 universities in the twenty first century[33]. The specific aim of the project is to assist the selected institutions "approach and reach the advanced international standards for the overall quality of teaching, scientific research, and the training of professional manpower, so as to establish their international prestige and position among universities in the world" (ibid: 27). The project has sparked intensified investment "in (95) key universities, and a batch of academic disciplines and specialisms…to enable them to reach the higher level in terms of educational quality, research, and management" (ibid: 23). These scholars claim that this is the most ambitious project for the development of HE in which the Chinese government has been involved. Huge sums have been invested (nearly 11 billion Yuan) and significant improvements have been achieved. The second phase of the project commenced in 2001 with the aim of continuing the development of key institutions and developing a number of key projects "to international standards" (ibid: 25).

This notion of reaching international standards is also reflected in a further strategy, henceforth referred to as the '985 Scheme'. The '985 Scheme' was first referred to by the then President and Vice-Chairman on separate occasions in May of 1998, hence its title. Its significance is that it was the first time that a national project to upgrade a

---

[32] These philanthropists are all well known in China. Run Run Shaw was the HK media magnate responsible also for setting up the Shaw Prize, Asia's answer to the Nobel Prize: Leung Kau Kui is another HK property magnate and business man, as is Henry Fok, who set up the Fok Ying Tung Foundation; Tsang Hin Chi is the current spokesperson for of the PRC government in HK

[33] Hence the '21': the remaining '1' standing for the 100

smaller number of universities (than the 211 project) to the level of the top flight of global HEIs had been announced.

Before we move to a look at the institutional context below, it is helpful to take into account some general comments from observers of the Chinese system. Ngok and Guo, for example, insist that despite all the organisational and administrative changes witnessed by the system, the control over the university by the state has remained intact, and that the state-university relationship has not fundamentally changed (Ngok and Guo: 41). Yang asserts that "the Chinese administrative system that is based on official authority and rank" and that this poses a "major challenge for Chinese universities" (Yang 2009). Chinese universities leaders are more politicians than academic leaders, and often an appointment as University President is just one step in the progress of a political career.

6.2.6 Institution Background / Faculty Background

I view the case study institution, IoC, is a typically large, publicly funded Chinese university, with equal funding coming from the MoE and the provincial government in which it is located. It was founded in 1924, and by 2007 there were 73,671 students. From the early 1990s, it has offered a complete range of degrees from bachelor, master to doctorate: 17,000 of the student total were post graduates in 2007.

IoC benefits from the two major national quality-raising projects described in the previous section: the 211 and the 985. It has been involved in the 211 project from its inception. Though not the in the first tranche of institutions involved in 985, it was supported by the provincial government from 2001 to the tune of 900 million yuan in order to gain an additional 300 million yuan from MoE (CRI). These extra funds are intended to be ring-fenced for strategies designed to work towards world-class status.

IoC is run by a President, who is supported by eight Vice Presidents. One contextual factor which should be borne in mind is that the position of President of a university is an overtly political appointment. One of my respondents made this general comment:

> "It's a highly centralised and hierarchical system, so a good President and a good Dean are very important. And it is very important that our current President has had three 2-year terms here...this continuity makes a lot of difference" (CR1).

We should also note that IoC is a part of the Chinese official system, and as such there is a high degree of bureaucracy. The five-year-plan is the norm and there is regular monitoring from Beijing:

> "College and Centre plans have to be approved by the Ministry of Education in Beijing for the record, maybe later for assessment. Five year plans will be examined at end to see if you achieved it; at the end of every year is an inspection and a form to fill in re conferences attended, papers published... so that's an annual review, or a support" (CR3).

There is also the influence of the Chinese Communist Party at every level within IoC: this will be referred to in the sections which follow. The respondent here summarises the role of the CCP Committees, which permeate the institution:

> "The Party Committees are responsible, together with the Committee of Youth Leaders, for Party members' affairs, for example, organising study seminars to study Central Party new documents; and they also recruit new Party members, who can get studentship awards etc and a recommendation to employers (CR3).

Rather than faculties, the operational organisational unit at IoC is the College. Each College is headed by a Dean. There are a number of Colleges which come under the umbrella term of Social Sciences. Within these Colleges are Departments which administer specific subject areas, as indicated below:

- Lingnan College: Business Management, Economics, International Business, Finance, Public Finance and Taxation, Risk Management and Insurance
- The School of Business: Business Administration, Marketing, Accounting, Tourism and Hotel Management, Finance and Investment
- The School of Law: Law Sciences
- The School of Government: Political Science and Public Administration, Administrative Management, Public Administration, Public Relations, Public Policies, Sociology, Social Work

I now move to an analysis of the interviews conducted at IoC.

6.3 Research Findings: the Faculty within the Wider Environment

6.3.1 A Context of Competition

In their conversations with me, my respondents at the IoC made many references to competition. However, they made few references to the global competitive environment, and these were rather general in nature. They appeared to see competition primarily as a domestic issue. The statement below is typical of the comments made about the general direction of the university, in that the position within the national setting appears to take priority over its international positioning:

> "The vision of the university is to be a research university with an international reputation – the top research university in China with an international reputation. (CR3)"

Though the notion of pursuing its international standing was mentioned on occasions, it was in the domestic situation where concrete examples of competition were cited. Here a respondent spoke about excellence in teaching:

> "The MoE organises a teaching evaluation campaign every 3years. If a teacher is designated at national level as an excellent teacher, it's a very important indicator for reputation. This is a recent development since the 1990s. There are 3 levels: university, provincial, and national" (CR8).

Similarly, there was a national system to recognise achievements at doctoral level:

> "Also, there are prizes for the best 100 PhD theses at national level; when IoC gets these, its a great honour for the university. If you could check websites – the introduction to universities like Bei Da etc – it will be mentioned here how many PhD theses were in the top 100, how many national best teachers etc."(CR4)

The domestic standing was seen as of great significance at IoC for two reasons. Firstly, respondents suggested that government funding was dependent upon status (CR2, CR3, CR9): and secondly, students often choose universities on the basis of their reputation, not on the basis of the course they want to do (CR3, CR11, CR10). Thus higher standing was expected to lead to the attraction of better students:

> "You see, some students choose the university simply because of the location... they might want to be in Shanghai or Beijing, for example. Others choose because of the reputation of a

university... they even do an extra Gao Kao year to get into Fudan or somewhere. It's not always the course which is important. This is why so many students find their courses difficult... I think its very inefficient (CR10)."

6.3.2 A Context of Organisational Change

Resonating with the official MoE literature (see, for example Zhou 2006), which suggests a turn towards more greater support for the Social Sciences, I was informed of the recent appointment of an advocate for the Social Sciences and Humanities at IoC:

"It was only a couple of months ago... one of the Vice-Presidents has been put in charge of these Colleges. He will be responsible for the development and integration of their work. But this change is so new that he has not made an impact yet. In fact, we don't really know his plans... but he has had one meeting to present cross-discipline projects within Social Sciences, and will be inviting people to participate in them" (CR8).

However, other than this development, there appear to have been few organisational changes at IoC in recent years. This could be explained by the considerable re-organisation through the 1980's and 1990's which have already re-shaped the university:

"There has been so much change in the post Mao era... you know, the university merged with others to become comprehensive, and there were many administrative changes. Actually, it's quite a settled period at the moment" (CR3).

But what many respondents spoke about were system changes, most of which are apparently aimed at improving quality. One informant was keen to show me a document which he had just received regarding new regulations for supervisors of doctoral students at IoC.

"This is quite usual here. Regulations such as this keep arriving (laughing)! These regulations are passed down to Deans and Centre Heads (such as myself), and we have to interpret them, and implement them. You see, these regulations are much tighter than the previous ones... supervisors must have a PhD themselves..." (CR3)

Another respondent provided another example of a system change which related to Quality Assurance:

"When papers are sat, they are secured, and all marked at the same time, to stop corruption. Previously lecturers could take the papers home, and there was some abuse of the system because of this. Now there is always a second marker...the fail rate has increased because of this" (CR5)

It is worth noting that issues surrounding quality assurance appeared to be linked with culture, specifically the importance of inter-personal relationships: this explains in part the constant system changes. A key respondent, with whom I spent some ten hours during the course of this study, was very keen to discuss the issues of cultural difference and their impact on practises at IoC. He was particularly aware of these differences; he was born and educated on the mainland but he also worked part time at a university in Hong Kong, and lived in the New Territories. He spoke about the influence of the Chinese Communist Party at all Chinese universities.

> "All organisations in China, including universities, must have a Party presence, at Institutional, College, and even class level... if there are party members in the class. At College level, a professor is the Party Secretary: his function is to have the final say on recruitment, to check personal dossiers, to recruit from student/staff body for new party members..." (CR3).

He was aware of covert practises and of the conflicts between 'the rule of man and the rule of law' which pervaded Chinese relationships, and which were evident at the IoC, and which could lead to intervention in academic affairs:

> "There are so many hidden regulations in China... If you hold 'different' opinions, these can be a threat to your position... there is no arbitration system here at IoC. Things are fluid, open to interpretation, regulations are flexible...you can get can get promotion depending on relationship with the Dean, the President or the Vice-President. The relationship between the Party Sec and President or Dean is very important... it can hold up progress at the university if this is not good. It's not good in my college, the Dean always complaining; maybe this Party Secretary guy is jealous..."(CR3).

He gave an example of 'hidden' norms:

> "A lecturer from Hong Kong was asked to second-mark a doctoral thesis: but because he is not from the mainland, he did not realise that by this stage, it was generally accepted that the thesis had been considered a pass. He failed the thesis. He got into a lot of trouble. You see, so many things are unspoken; you have to know how things are done" (CR3).

6.3.3 A Context of League Tables

My respondents were well aware of the standing of IoC in the domestic league tables:

> " There are many league tables in China, but generally, in the most reputable of these, IoC has been at number seven, or eight, sometimes nine, during the last five years (turning to a colleague for confirmation; the colleague nodded his assent). It's quite consistent. Its very difficult for us to break into the top five, you know, they are so well established..." (CR8)

However, the interviewees expressed little interest or concern about global rankings: a vice-Dean did not appear to be aware of the rankings discussed in Chapter 2 (CR8), and others were rather dismissive of the idea:

> "World-class universities? Over 40 claim to be this in China! (laughing) I don't take much notice of them, I don't consider them an authority. But of course one of the goals of the chancellor is to improve the university globally. The reputation has improved greatly over the last 10 years" (CR3).

But the conversations in which I was involved became more considered whenever the domestic situation became the focus. There was agreement that the Ministry of Education does evaluate undergraduate education and graduate schools, but the information is either unpublished, and is considered too complicated for the general public to understand. MoE officials have repeatedly stressed opposition to university rankings, but this has not curbed 'commercial' ranking activity:

> "The problem is that these non-official rankings could influence education authorities to give more funding to higher-ranked universities. Our civil society is not strong enough, so the growth in the number of ranking systems will remain until the public eventually accepts the more authoritative and neutral ones" (CR8).

> "Yes... for example, one of the rankings is created by an organisation in Shenzhen - 'Wu Su Lian' - recently families have been taking notice of it for where to send their kids. It's supposed to be an NGO, but I suspect he's making a profit... perhaps some universities are paying him... It's a publication, and a website. Many reputable universities won't cooperate with him" (CR3).

The analysis now moves away from the wider contexts towards a focus on governance within the Faculty at IoC.

6.4 Research findings: Practice within the Faculty

6.4.1 The Role of the Dean

My key informant regarding the role of the Dean at IoC was the Dean of the College of Politics, in charge of three departments and an institute, who was appointed in 2008 for his first four year term. He saw his role as having five strands:

> "Well, firstly, Deans have to represent their university, so you have to have a relatively high academic reputation; then, there are the administrative responsibilities. Another important feature is having good relationships with colleagues, *and* you have to have the trust from the university central authorities (including Party Committee), that you can implement their directives. Then you have to have the competence to raise money and improve the income situation of colleagues. I've been lucky: I have managed to attracted funds also from local sources and abroad (Korean, Ford Foundation, and World Bank)" (CR8).

Having the trust of the higher ranks within IoC appeared to be a vital element in being appointed as Dean. The Director of a Research Centre in the College of Politics outlined the process of appointment:

> "The process is something between election and appointment. He was not elected directly by faculty members. However, colleagues were given a chance to make nominations... then the university authorities made a decision as to who will be the candidate (normally, only one candidate). Moreover, before the name was finalized, colleagues were encouraged to make comments on the appointment. If no serious opposition occurs, the university authorities will make the announcement of appointment. So the whole process is consistent with the principle of "democratic centralism" (CR3).

The Dean identified a particular area where he felt his leadership style was contributing to quality and reputation building: that is, in suppressing the relationship or *guanxi* factor. As so often with IoC personnel responses, he took some time to arrive at the point:

> "In seeking a good reputation, you have to interact very actively with staff. I try always to discuss issues with faculty, it's a collegiate approach, and I want to promote talented staff. It depends on the leadership style and on the environment, on the existing culture. There's a difference to 10 years ago: a fundamental change here, towards the future. Some universities go backwards... one in central China, we say 'turn round and run fast' – previously it had a high reputation – the president chose friends, or people who would obey him, and lots of staff left, and some of them came to IoC" (CR8)

6.4.2 The Significance of, and Strategies for Building a Reputation

The Dean was very clear about the reasons for reputation-building at IoC.

> "One of the goals of the President is to improve the university, nationally and globally. The reputation has improved greatly over the last 10 years. And what is the purpose of a good reputation? It's easier to attract high quality faculty staff and high quality students, and funding. Let me give you an example: The University of X (in the same city as IoC) has fantastic funding from a Hong Kong business man, but that University can't attract high quality students... it does not have the reputation which we enjoy"(CR8).

Though the rival institution may have been struggling, respondents nevertheless felt that there was a direct relationship between reputation and the level of outside financial support they could attract:

> "The better the reputation, then we get a lot of money from our alumni, for example, Mr Run Run Shaw (a well known benefactor)" (CR1).

But returning to the strategies regarding reputation building, the Dean and a Research Centre Director pointed out that attracting and rewarding quality staff was one of the priorities, and that this represented a system change:

> "The President has been recruiting, appointing scholars of high reputation globally as part of the '100 plan'... 240 high quality scholars have been recruited by IoC in the last 10 years, including some foreign people, for example, from Germany, Russia, and the USA. They get the same pay, but they get a generous starting bonus at the beginning, and subsidized housing, etc, and research funds at different levels. And there are rewards policies for existing staff: promotion from lecturers to associate professors to professors: formerly, ten years ago, this wasn't based on research, but on seniority; now it's based on research, you know, performance-related" (CR8).

> "Yes, and each School has its own ideas too. Again, it's on our website...'outstanding academic staff may be given extra money for research, extra subsidies for settling in (the city)'... and also ... 'to attract high level talent, especially from overseas'..." (CR3).

The staff appraisal system was an attempt to ensure quality:

> "All teaching staff are evaluated by IoC... this came in, in 1999 after the universities merged. Since 2002, all staff are employed on contract, there is no tenure" (CR 2).

I was also informed that Chinese pragmatism, and contradictions between university regulations, internal practices, and national labour laws, had also to be factored in when assessing the effectiveness of these appraisal systems:

"There is an annual review, and a 3 year review if you are on contract. First you make a self assessment (there are three categories: excellent, pass, not pass). Normally, people just say 'pass' (laughing). Academic staff should publish at least 1 paper per year – and will be given a spoken warning if they do not do so. Maybe the Dean will say, at a faculty plenary meeting, that some people have failed to fulfil the basic requirement, maybe some staff members have not produced any articles in the last one or two years. But so far I know of *no* cases where people's contracts have not been renewed. Sometimes my Dean complains 'I'd just like to fire someone (laughing)!' But according to Chinese labour law, two contracts done and you are permanent. But here in China, we don't like to offend people" (CR3).

"I know some a few teachers who got ill or unhappy, and some left the university because of the pressure. Some professors become administrators so that they don't get evaluated, though they still teach!"(CR2).

Attracting able students is another priority in reputation building. One of the strategies here is the 'Open Day':

> "We invite a lot of good schools and their teachers and their students to come to IoC to visit, to look at our programmes and our facilities. We try to build good relationships with their Head teachers. It's just another way of marketing ourselves..." (CR8).

New building was also seen as very helpful in raising the profile of Social Science colleges. Most of these colleges at IoC were due to move into new buildings on a new campus, though the new Dean did not know the history of the decision to regroup and renew:

> "The better the physical facilities, the more attractive to students. With the 211 and 985 projects, important universities have been improved and gained new facilities etc. But you have to remember that most of similar universities have also been modernised and upgraded. This faculty will soon move to East Campus, next semester...it's about 35 minutes by shuttle bus, but eventually we will do all our work there. Perhaps we will be able to cooperate more when we are all over there together, you know, the social sciences" (CR8).

6.4.3 The Research Culture

Following on from the previous section, establishing high profile research capability was also a strategy in building reputation; in fact, it was regarded as the key factor. As has already been mentioned, a Vice President is now responsible for encouraging cross disciplinary projects within the Colleges of Social Science. If we look at this respondent's words again, it is clear that the word 'research' is paramount:

> "The vision of the university is to be a research university with an international reputation – the top research university in China with an international reputation. (CR3)"

The 'publish or perish' principle applied as strongly at IoC as it did elsewhere, and was linked to both reputation and promotion:

> "Publishing in top *international* journals if the main strategy for enhancing reputation. In China, pressure has increased over the last 5-6 years. Evidence can be seen in IoC in staff promotions. If a member of staff can publish an article in the top 10 *domestic* journals, they will definitely get promotion" (CR3). "The Colleges (in Social Sciences) are making a plan to publish in international publications... it's a part of the 5 year plan...to publish at least 20 English articles during that 5 year period"(CR3).

Research targets were tied into the planning process:

> "The Colleges (in Social Sciences) are making a plan to publish in international publications... it's a part of the 5 year plan... to publish at least 20 English articles during that 5 year period"(CR3).

Much of the research activity appeared to be 'top down' in nature, and achieving funding was considered as a mark of prestige:

> "There are lots of research projects created by the university. And there are government projects...if you get a national level research grant, or provincial level, or ministry level, then the government decides the topic, or the MoE or NSSF (National Social Science Foundation)... competition for national level projects is very intense. It's a very important indicator of university reputation. Every year the university will reveal how many projects are being sponsored at this level... this is another important indicator when the university is assessed" (CR8).

Research projects from staff were also encouraged by the Dean as part of his Research Strategy Plan

> "We have a policy in College: young colleagues are questioned about their research interests, and funds are made available to them to carry out suitable projects. Actually this is quite a change from my early experience... there were very few opportunities for this 'bottom up' approach" (CR8).

As of the time of my last visit to IoC in 2009, there were no collaborative research projects with other universities.

> "Research collaborations? Just with local government, not with other universities, for example with (name of adjacent city) government, to set up a research institute situated there. Maybe some departments offer join programmes that other students, maybe from Hong Kong, could join, but it hasn't happened yet for Social Science, perhaps for ideological/political reasons" (CR3).

6.4.4 Internationalisation and Stratification

IoC's approach to the process of internationalisation is at least in part influenced by the MoE, and has become part of the strategic planning of the university. Internationalisation is reflected in the undergraduate curriculum, in planning documents, in staff structures, and in efforts to seek partners, as the following conversation revealed:

"Two years ago every department was asked to rewrite their curriculum, for all their undergraduate courses, to reflect internationalisation, with effect from the new 5 year plans in 2008; so all students should be exposed to comparisons of systems, or mention of different approaches" (CR2).

"Yes, you see the 5 year plan of the College includes all development, staff development, student exchanges etc – but should include internationalisation in all plans, such as curriculum, publication, translation, invitations etc. Every year the university has a special fund for inviting international scholars and visiting professors. The Dean and others go abroad regularly to seek international collaboration, sign agreements; sometimes the follow-up is difficult, as sometimes people pull out" (CR3).

"It's a long term goal, so policy ideas go towards this. It's written down on the website, for example..."to attract foreign students etc... and to encourage links internationally, including with Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan" (CR8).

IoC has an Office of International Affairs, which is largely responsible for the administrative arrangements for foreign students, staff and visitors, and College academic staff who have particular responsibilities for collaboration between College and international partners. A respondent (an academic) who was charged with the latter responsibility spoke of her efforts to arrange student exchanges in the U.S.: it should be noted that she was working with existing partners:

> "I went to USA with a delegation of 6 people from our university and visited 8 universities to look into partnerships – the 8 universities were chosen as there was some existing connection already. One vice-president came too... and the previous Dean of the School of Government also came. There was no formal planning beforehand – just email arrangements etc. Most discussion was at School level, but I also met vice-presidents at the US universities; agreements to make contributions to the strategic partnership" (CR4).

One of her colleagues disclosed to me later that many of the MoU's (Memeorandum of Understanding) signed were rather limited in their results. The present Dean said (with great good humour) that he had refused to go on some of these visits, as he was too busy. He did travel often in the course of his duties: he showed me his passport which allowed him to travel outside China without the normal formalities and visa regulations.

The interest in Internationalisation also extended to staff visits. There appeared to be "greater opportunity for staff to travel, with more kinds of scholarships available" (CR2).

> "We have programmes to encourage internationally respected staff to visit...they will get support/funding...8000 yuan to 20000 yuan for each professor...for a one month visit" (CR7).

However he did provide an interesting anecdote about the nature of the partners IoC was seeking:

> "When a colleague was arranging to visit a not very famous university, the President had him into his office. He was very angry and shouted at this colleague, and said he'd cancel the plan,

> could not support it... because the research quality was not good enough. So you see, it has to be the right sort of partner institution!" (CR7).

Regarding international students, IoC appeared to have very few, but they were well supported. Though all lessons are taught in Chinese, overseas students had many privileges: they were separately accommodated in 'superior' units, and could write assignments/essays in English. A South Asian doctoral student informed me that he was provided with a tutor to assist certain elements of his study.

Regarding visiting staff, I met two visitors (a French mathematician, and a German statistician) who explained that for each, their semester stay involved teaching areas of their disciplines in which there was no expertise at IoC, and very little in China.

6.4.5 Teaching, Student Feedback and a Client-based Culture

The relationship between student and teacher at IoC seemed to have the traditional Chinese warmth, though this was cooling as a result of massification. Nevertheless, normal student evaluation is built in to teaching systems. And my respondents had strong opinions about being university staff in China.

Every professor under 60years old at IoC was required to teach undergraduate students (CR8). There was a consensus that relationships between staff and student were considered to be very important, and were different in quality to that of other nations:

> "The relationship between student and faculty staff is very personal, not like a firm and customer, as it is in the States. But it's not as good as 20 years ago when I often had students round for a big meal, but now things are much busier" (CR8).

Within the last decade, teachers were evaluated by students and this evaluation was compulsory; successful evaluations were rewarded:

> "There is teaching evaluation by students, every semester; if a course can get 90 points from students (out of 100), the teacher will be financially rewarded (with 1000 yuan). It's compulsory for students to complete the evaluation, otherwise they don't pass the course. This isn't a national policy, it's our own; it's from the late 1990s, and is dependent on the financial position...in good years we get more! Students' ranking of lecturers is very important in promotion and the reputation of staff" (CR3).

My questions relating to office hours prompted a general discussion of the differences between policy and practice, and the working conditions for Chinese academics. First, the official view:

> "Every faculty must have office hours that every student knows" (CR8).

A colleague saw the situation in a different light:

> "Yes, you have office hours – you've got to be in your office, but here in China, the majority of staff members don't follow that requirement" (CR3).

He continued to talk about the differences between academic work in China and in other parts of the world:

> "Let me tell you the difference between working at (a UK university) and at (a Hong Kong university): as a professor in China, teaching, not as manager, you are very free. After your teaching duties, no one can control you. You can go anywhere and make money if you want, if you're not interested in promotion. But HK and UK are much stricter; there is so much micro management, it's very tight, so it's difficult for people to work in more than one institution".
>
> "Will there be more micro management? Yes, I think so, but only if the university can provide better working conditions, salary and benefits, then the university will demand more control over their staff. For example, you should attend meetings, but most staff do not, and you are not challenged, so now staff who attend are paid. Money is available (up to 1000 yuan per meeting) to get people to attend" (CR3)

6.4.6 Concluding Comments

The first point I make in these remarks is a qualitative one: my respondents at IoC spoke with a remarkable air of confidence which I did not detect in respondents from the other institutions in the study. I do not know what to attribute this to! The level of competition at IoC appeared to be rather measured, and the respondents were relaxed about league tables. There had been extensive reorganisation associated with massification, mergers and the search for quality. There was more direction and steering of faculty members than at the start of the decade, through increased monitoring of research and teaching activities, and encouragement of international activity, but this was muted by a 'concern for human relations': I was informed that China was a country where official discretion takes precedence over the rule of law.

The study now moves to a contextual analysis of HE in Hong Kong.

Chapter 7. The Institute of Hong Kong: Contexts and Findings

This chapter examines the context in which IoHK developed, and the findings from the empirical part of the study.

7.1 Introduction

Xiang gang, or 'fragrant harbour', referred to a small island lying off the south coast of the Chinese Imperial province of Guangdong, until it was ceded to Britain in 1842, following the hostilities of the Opium Wars. British interest in the Island was always as a stepping stone into the mainland, and the vast possibilities of trade. During the nineteenth century, further territory was added to the portfolio of what was to be known as Hong Kong, then a colony[34] of the British Empire; this situation remained until 1997 when the territory was returned to Beijing. Hong Kong's strategic location on the international trade routes, and its open door policy, soon fashioned it into a place where the East met the West. With a population dominated by Chinese, it was nevertheless always a metropolitan location where many nationalities lived and worked, giving it a unique atmosphere.

7.2 The Development of Higher Education: Political, Economic and Social Contexts

HE in Hong Kong has been shaped by its status as a British colony, its relationship with the PRC, its reliance on trade, the social demand for education, and the attempts of the territory to re-fashion itself: it is only against these economic, political and social contexts that we can understand the developments in education. In their consideration of institutional disarticulation, Poon and Wong consider that there are a number of distinct periods during which educational developments might be considered to have reacted to different pressures in the geographical area (Poon and Wong 2003: 3). I adapt their ideas here to suggest that we might think of four periods when HE has

---

[34] A colony it may have been, but the area was always dependent on China for its food and water supplies.

shown distinct characteristics, that is, 1911-1941, 1945-1971, 1971-1997, and from its return to the PRC to the present day.

7.2.1 1911-1941

During this period, Hong Kong was administered as a British colony: trade with China boomed during this period, despite the chaos which some parts of the mainland experienced during this time. The colonial government established the first university in 1911, in the words of the then governor, to "help serve the educational needs of an awakening China" (Mak & Postiglione 1997: 58). But the literature also suggests there were other considerations: inter-colonial rivalry is quoted as a contributory factor in its development. It is suggested that Governor Lugard felt an urgent need to establish an institution to rival Tongji University, which the Germans had completed in Shanghai: perhaps, then, we should see reputation building, a major theme of this study, as a cornerstone in the origins of Hong Kong's HE. Certainly what is not referred to in the literature is a plan as to how the new university might shape the future of the colony: this reaction to events elsewhere, rather than coherent internal planning, regularly emerges as a feature of the growth of the sector.

The institution which was created was Hong Kong University. It traces its origins to the Hong Kong College of Medicine, founded by the London Missionary Society in 1887. The Faculty of Medicine was soon followed by those of Engineering, Arts and Science. Governance at the new university, collegiate and de-centralised, appears to have been in sharp contrast to the highly centralised education system in the primary and secondary sectors in Hong Kong at the time, when the spread of ideas from the mainland prompted control of all schools in these sectors through their registration, their inspection, the deployment of head teachers, and strong curricular guidance (Poon & Wong, op.cit: 4).[35] Yet the goal of "serving the educational needs of an awakening China" was never realised, and so the university was redefined to meet the needs of Hong Kong itself (Mak & Postiglione: op.cit: 58).

---

[35] The 1913 Education Ordnance was enacted to safeguard against political infiltration: teachers were forbidden to discuss politics in class (Poon & Wong, op.cit: 4).

7.2.2 1945-1971

The post-war period should be seen against a context of rapidly increasing population, sea changes in economic direction, and the transfer of governance from Britain to the Hong Kong government. Poon and Wong provide strong evidence that this was a period when Hong Kong was moving rapidly towards self government (Poon and Wong op. cit: 5), and consider that we can describe this period as one of 'decolonisation'. Regardless of these changes, the centralised nature of the primary and secondary sectors of education remained, as did relative autonomy for the university sector.

This was a time of enormous population growth, partly due to a high birth rate, and partly fuelled by in-migration from a troubled mainland; the Communist Party had achieved victory in the civil war, and diplomatic and trade relations ceased with the UN embargo. With the economic *raison d'etre* of the territory arrested, the decision was made to encourage export-led manufacturing, a policy which was hugely successful, and which transformed the region into an economic 'dragon'.

Socially, this era saw the beginnings of the pressures to democratise, as students and intellectuals in Hong Kong echoed the great protest movements and political turmoil taking place in China, the United States and Europe. The literature points to the challenge to the political control of the colonial authorities during the sixties, which persuaded the authorities to provide a second university where the medium of instruction would be Chinese; this provision has been interpreted as a political reaction rather than part of a plan tertiary education. Three privately funded colleges were merged to create the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In terms of governance, the new university followed the British model: it was a comprehensive university with a variety of faculties, unlike the specialised universities of the PRC at that particular time.

The move to self government, mentioned earlier, is manifest in the establishment of the Universities Grant Committee (UGC - a name borrowed from the colonial parent), which was set up to fund and coordinate the two tertiary institutions, acting as a buffer between government and the sector. Some commentators suggest that in this period, we can observe the beginnings of the tertiary sector's turn toward the political and

economic needs of the territory, as it began to supply the professional manpower needed to serve its rapidly growing economy and social projects (Wu 1992).

7.2.3 1971-1997

"The 1970's were the turning point in Hong Kong's social, political and economic development" ((Poon & Wong, op.cit: 7). Economically, Hong Kong experienced further advances during this period, by the end of which the territory was a full member of the WTO, APEC and the Asian Development Bank. The success of the manufacturing-for-export strategy, together with the return of trade as the PRC 'opened up' in the late 1970s, had allowed the move into services. It was at this time that Hong Kong became an international centre for trade and finance (Poon & Wong, op.cit: 8). The shift into the service sector will emerge as an important theme in this study.

We see in this period the extension of integrated planning with the establishment of the Education and Manpower Branch (EMB) in 1983. The board reported on perceived manpower needs, which were interpreted into educational provision at all levels including universities, tying the tertiary sector into the economy of the territory (Chow 1985). Thus the new university which came into being in the late 1980s was built with an emphasis on science, technology, management and business studies: there was also the drive to further research activities as the significance of new knowledge to the economy was acknowledged. The UGC directed the tertiary sector to increase their international activities, in a futher attempt to maintain its relative position (UGC 1996: 172). And in the 1990's, the debate regarding the transformation of Hong Kong into a regional hub for services, including tertiary education, emerged.

As a result of the economic prosperity, a growing middle-class emerged, a middle-class which of course created a demand for tertiary education. And there was a political will to fulfil that demand: in the late 1980s, a brain drain of professionals fearful of the return of the colony to China, was such a threat to the future economy that the UK Governor of the day, David Wilson, accelerated the expansion of HE and arranged that "nearly all of the capital and recurrent costs of university education were to be paid for by the government" (Post 2008). This political factor criticised as 'knee-jerk' by some commentators (Postiglione and Mak op.cit: 240), drove a unique investment that has resulted in a HE system which some describe as remarkable (ibid). By the end of 1997,

after reorganisations and continued growth, eight institutions were recognised as universities; the number of age-appropriate students entering undergraduate classes grew from 2% in 1981 to18% in 1997 (Poon & Wong, op.cit: 8). A further aspect of HE since the early 1990s has been a proliferation of offshore programmes offered by overseas universities, predominantly from the English-speaking world, feeding on the demand created by increased prosperity and the growing middle-class.

It is also necessary to view this period in the context of the transformation in the public sector. That government encountered reduced financial capacity to finance all the demands from, and for, HE, is well documented, and spawned the wave of NPM described in an earlier chapter. One could argue that the Hong Kong government's response was been typical of the 'Anglo' model of such reforms. Thus the drives for efficiency, effectiveness and economy, within a framework of decentralisation, were observed, following a variety of reports published by the UGC: operational functions were passed to individual universities, giving a greater degree of 'day to day' autonomy, though the state maintained control through quality control and performance indicator systems (Mok 2003: 121-123).

7.2.4 1997 - Present

The success of the service industry sector, and the continuing decline in manufacturing in the face of more attractive locations within Asia, has prompted the government to further the idea of Hong Kong's future as Asia's world city (UGC 2004), and as a service-providing regional hub[36] in finance, health and education, underlining how wider government policy intersects with HE. This over-arching strategy is reflected in the UGC's directive to HE to further increase its engagement, for example, in the internationalisation process (Mok 2007: 8; Intensive interviews with HKR1, HKR2 and Phillips: 2008).

The autonomy and academic freedom enjoyed in the past are jealously guarded by academics; it is not surprising to see concern in the literature about governance. Poon

---

[36] The UGC sees the Hong Kong higher education sector serving as 'the education hub of the region', driving forward the economic and social development of Hong Kong, In the context of the uniquerelationship with Mainland China and the region (UGC 2004)

and Wong raise the issues of a turn to central control; they cite incidents of government ministers interfering in matters such as admissions, which were once the sole domain of the universities (Poon & Wong op.cit:14). Mok and Lee posit that policy making is becoming increasingly 'top-down' (Mok & Lee 1999). Nevertheless Mok asserts that the engagement of HKSAR with HEIs is part of a wider commitment to human resource development, and the belief that the nurturing of the region's people is "fundamental to the future success of Hong Kong" (Mok 2006: 128). A recent UGC report claims that: "human capital is the single most important asset of Hong Kong" (UGC 2004). With such imperatives at large, it should perhaps be no surprise that the UGC seeks control of policy direction.

In 2000 and in 2002, the HKSAR conducted fresh comprehensive reviews of its HE system (Mok 2006: 170); the 2002 report, also known as the Sutherland Report after its author, is seen as particularly influential (Chiu 2006: 30) . The Report was convened in the context of debates surrounding the expansion of HE in the SAR into 'associate degrees' and 'community colleges' (Chiu op cit: 31). Sutherland's response to these debates was to advocate the strengthening of those institutions which appeared capable of competing internationally, through a Quality Assurance process and an increasing competition for resources.

Following this, Hong Kong's universities have been involved in a self-categorising or differentiating process, in which individual institutions have been asked to identify their strengths and missions (Mok 2007: 8). The UGC has identified roles for each individual HE institution. The point here is that rather than seeing a distinct tier of institutions, as we have seen in the PRC (Chapter 6), HKSAR envisages a system of institutions which support each other in achieving excellence for the benefit of each institution and the whole community.

What is interesting here is that HKSAR sees more, rather than less, control of the HE system as the new century develops, in the wider context of HE being 'balanced with policy and economic objectives' (UGC 2004). The UGC will need to become a much more proactive player, and, as stated in the Higher Education Review: "strengthen its role in strategic planning and policy development, so as to advise and steer the degree awarding sector" (ibid). It should be noted that the word *steer* is underlined in the text of the original document: hardly surprising, then, that scholars have noted pressures

from above. This aforementioned steering is to be achieved by such devices as performance and role-related funding, examining the 'Academic Development Proposals', and "monitoring much more closely in what areas institutions are carrying out research, and in what areas they undertake taught programmes" (ibid).

Collaboration is another theme of the above report, which is driven by an international or at least an inter-regional agenda (ibid). At the macro level, HE is expected to make its contribution to CEPA (The Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement), a scheme which takes up the challenge of a mutually beneficial relationship between Hong Kong, the Pearl River Delta and Mainland China; City University of Hong Kong's involvement in Research and Development in Shenzhen is but one example of how this policy is taking shape[37] (Mok 2006: 128). At the institutional level, the UGC has suggested "deep collaboration" among universities, seeing each as a part of an interlocking system (as seen above), in order to promote, for example, better quality research outcomes (Mok 2006: 5). Again, it does seem that HEIs in Hong Kong are facing increasing complexity, and this is perhaps the context in which one should view their future.

The proposed regional collaboration includes reference to 'student exchange' programmes. I draw this section to a close referring to the aforementioned UGC reports regarding the *scale* of the student exchange which is envisaged:

> "Academic exchange between Hong Kong and Mainland China can play a significant role in knowledge exchange between the two places. Hong Kong can and should play a facilitating role in linking the Mainland and the world at large. To do this Hong Kong requires graduates who are culturally sensitive to the developments in the Mainland - and this is best achieved if they are educated here in indigenous institutions. We foresee a significant increase in the non-local student population, a large proportion of whom will come from the Mainland. Our HE sector, which is internationalized, will provide Mainland students with a valuable international perspective. The academic and economic value of a significant increase in cross-border institutional activity could be huge. If our institutions are alert and nimble, there is synergy, mutual enhancement and diversified finance to be garnered" (UGC 2004).

Thus, a century after the founding of the HE system, it seems that the aim of that colonial government "to help serve the educational needs of an awakening China" (Mak & Postiglione op.cit: 58), might finally be relevant. Thus Hong Kong's universities face an intriguing future; launched in1911 with a 'medieval' governance regime, it

---

[37] See Mok's discussion of the entrepreneurial university (Mok 2006:118-137).

appears that today, governance, as elsewhere in the world, is becoming ever more sophisticated and complex. What current governance practices are emerging at the case study university is the focus of this chapter.

Following the section above relating to the wider political, economic and social contexts in which HE has developed, there will be a brief consideration of the unique context of the case study institution, which for the sake of anonymity will be referred to as the Institute of Hong Kong (IoHK), and that of the case study faculty, that is, Social Science.

7.2.5 Institutional and Faculty Contexts

IoHK is incorporated under a Hong Kong Ordinance of 1964: the main governing bodies for which the Ordinance and Statutes provide are the Court, the Council, the Senate and the Boards of the faculties. Of these, only the Council and Senate are given power by the Ordinance to make regulations (IoHK website). IoHK has grown from its original intake of less than a hundred students to a current intake of just over 23,000 students, who enter into one of the ten faculties. The proportion of undergraduates to post graduates is approaching parity (12,150 undergraduates, 11,250 postgraduates). IoHK boasts the largest number of research postgraduate students of any university in the territory: these students currently make up over 10% of the total student population. It describes itself in its Mission Statement as "... a pre-eminent international university in Asia, (which) seeks to sustain and enhance its excellence as an institution of higher learning through outstanding teaching and world-class research": the university's global ambitions are clear from this statement.

My limited research into the organisation of the university at inception suggests that IoHK was modelled on the British university of the day that is, with a large measure of faculty and professorial independence (Slopes 2007). I heard, on a number of occasions, the notion that in its early years, there were 'x' little kingdoms at IoHK, 'x' being a variable number representing the number of faculties: the suggestion here is that of a high degree of professional autonomy. My own interpretation is that 'x' should have represented the number of Departments, such was the degree of freedom to operate at this level: budgets were, for example, devolved to the Department.

The Faculty of Social Sciences was established in 1967 and now comprises the Departments of Geography, Politics and Public Administration, Psychology, Social Work and Social Administration, and Sociology, with an academic staff of just over 70 professionals. Four assistant Deans report to the Dean regarding (respectively) teaching and learning, research, postgraduate operations, and collaborative work. The faculty has ten multidisciplinary research centres that provide a platform for research interaction and collaboration among colleagues on campus and in the wider world. IoHK is implementing a 4-year curriculum from 2012; with this change in mind the faculty has identified two core themes to guide future development: social innovation and global citizenship. The faculty mirrors the university in a near parity of undergraduate to postgraduate students.

I now present the research findings for IoHK.

7.3 Research Findings: the Faculty within the Wider Environment

7.3.1 A Context of Competition

The respondents to this study were keen to point out that their work in the faculty could only be understood in the context of competition within the sector, a competition which transcended national boundaries, and a competition which was deepening and which was somehow 'new'. Alongside this notion of competition was the idea that their performance was increasingly measured against the performance of others, and that stakeholders made judgements against the background of these performatives. These ideas are neatly summarised by an Assisstant Dean of Social Sciences at the IoHK:

> "We are living in a globalizing world, and the whole context has become so competitive now, competition is not coming from the local universities but from regional, and globally. And we have to perform in order to attract good scholars to come and work with us, and at the same time our students base choices on university league tables" (HKR2).

The situation in the territory is that within the HE sector there are a number institutions of high repute: in this context it is not surprising that the Dean of Social Sciences at IoHK, in contrast to his assistant above, was keen to emphasise the significance of the local within the wider framework of performatives:

> "In many ways it's the local reputation which is kind of key, um, you know the newspapers publish comparative tables by programme, of the kinds of grades we are looking for, for students to come in, that's quite a big thing here, I'm much more concerned about how our programmes are ranked inside IoHK, there's 3, 4 programmes in the top ten at this university, if that starts to slip then I'm really concerned. But also with the ranks within Hong Kong....strange, given that we are all talking about global ranking, it might seem a complete inverse, but my attention is mainly on the local...how we are doing against other faculties in HK and how we are doing against other Social Science faculties in Hong Kong..." (HKR1).

That Hong Kong faced particular challenges, and perhaps had unique advantages in this competitive environment, emerged as a theme in many of my conversations: these notions resonated with the "competitive state" literature (for example, Jessop). I was told that Hong Kong faced the problem of being marginalised by larger, possibly better politically connected, mainland cities (HKR3), and the response to this was for HK universities and the territory in general, to think strategically:

> "We have to radiate out, to compete nationally and globally– we don't want to slowly lose our "image" – become like Beijing, Shanghai etc. So in discussion and planning stages, we have talked about Hong Kong being a 'regional hub' for HE.... the eight universities in HK are thinking along these lines" (HKR3).

Balancing this view was the impression of Hong Kong's strengths:

> "And it's not that only Asian governments support education more than the UK but there is a wider culture... they couldn't do it to the extent they do if the wider culture was not also supportive of education. The whole public discourse here is about doing something for Hong Kong – investing in education...for example, we have one major donor, we tell her how much we need, she just gives it to us" (HKR1).

Further:

> "I personally believe that what makes HK different from other cities is our experience as a place which is a melting point. So that's why I think HK should do more about internationalising our university" (HKR2).

These pressures to perform were conceived as pressures which were also bringing about "governance changes, in this new competitive environment" (HKR3). It is these changes which will be the subject of later sections in this chapter.

7.3.2 A Context of Organisational Change

At IoHK, much organisational change was occurring: though perhaps not to the extent of Marginson's (2000) premise of 'revolving door' governance. Nevertheless there were clear indications of strategic centralisation at the level of both senior management and of the faculty, and of the importance of stakeholders other than faculty staff. What was interesting was the very recent nature of those changes.

In 2005 the senior management had introduced a wider brief for its Deputy Vice Chancellors: they now are "charged with driving particular agendas, such as internationalisation" (HKR2). More recently, the SMT had identified 19 Strategic Research Themes (SRT's)that would be promoted across the university, clearly presenting some degree of challenge to an earlier governance model when individuals had more autonomy:

> "....in terms of governance, it's quite open here....we have a lot of autonomy... IoHK is based on the principle of collegiality....the ten faculties have had a very decentralised model....but recently the SMT here has re-visited the way that the university is governed....so now in terms of governance its more centralised decentralisation" (HKR2).

In similar vein, the Dean was keen not to exaggerate the external pressures he faced:

> "Nothing has filtered down to my level. I don't feel any pressure from the government. I guess at VC level it filters through, they're responding to pressures and I think some of it is informal over dinner, at meetings, so you never read it in the press... so they may be responding to triggers from the government... there may not be policy document" (HKR1).

Though these responses are quite nuanced, in that the Dean and his assistant did not wish to suggest that there had been draconian changes in terms of governance style, the assistant Dean did hint that pressures existed to increase the degree of centralisation:

> "I believe the SMT want to seize the opportunity to centralise, and the change to a four year undergraduate degree course provides that opportunity... there should be some common degree framework, learning experiences through our common core courses... so there are curriculum agendas at SMT but faculty members are still consulted...." (HKR2).

Leverage was also being exerted above the senior managers, from Council members:

> "Yeah, but also by the council, they give a lot of advice, compare to the old ways, from stories I have heard, there is a change now, but... But still the VC plays a very important role, perhaps a first amongst equals. But every PVC is given a portfolio, and they have to drive the agenda, within a consultative framework of the SMT, and with Council" (HKR2).

The Dean agreed that enthusiasm and engagement came from quarters where it had not previously been seen:

> "There is pressure from the university...when the university got it's Times higher ranking, 'x' out of 200, the Council chairman, who is a famous businessman in Hong Kong, told the VC that we should use this as an opportunity, use this as a platform to inform the world about how great IoHK is. So this week the VC is leading a delegation to the West coast of the states..." (HKR1).

Governance changes were equally clear at faculty level. Not only had the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences been appointed for the first time in 2006, rather than being elected from faculty staff, but the term of office had been extended to a five year term rather than the three years under the previous arrangements. Further, the appointment was a short term contract, though the Dean expected to serve for another five years (HKR1).

> "Another example of centralisation is the appointed Deans system... so you see the centre (of the university) is trying to recentralise at Dean's level. And the budget has been given to the faculty, and taken out of the Head of Departments hands. The reason for this is performance...the universities are under tremendous pressure to perform here in HK" (HKR2).

Since the appointment of the Dean, the Head's of Department had also been appointed (by the Dean) rather than elected by faculty staff.

> "Yeah, they are appointed, it's in my brief, I have the final say, even if everybody else wants someone else...! So they are *my* Heads in that sense, people I feel comfortable working with...that's probably important in the new faculty environment" (HKR1).

7.3.3 A Context of Global League Tables

We have already seen above how respondents perceived league tables, global and local, as factors in student choice and the Dean's motivations. These instruments appear to be have been *analysed* by IoHK staff, and emerge as *pressures for action* or change, in areas such as internationalisation and the direction of research. When I asked about their impact, the answer was unequivocal:

> Question: "How much do you deconstruct those tables in order to see your way forward? Or are they just tokens?"
>
> Response: (Sounds exasperated) "We have no choice (HKR2)!"

It emerged that the respondent was particularly interested in, and had considerable knowledge of, the two best known global tables:

> "The Shanghai index focuses more on research. It also has some international indicators, but IoHK was ranked quite low because of a certain Anglo-Saxon bias... but you can argue they have the more hard data than the THES but these are debatable because it is more science-based and Anglo-Saxon orientated" (HKR2).

He expressed his opinion that the THES rank was more balanced: certainly IoHK was better served by this instrument:

> "My feeling is that the Times one is more balanced. It draws not only on research, but also about student learning and progress, talks about the reputation, asking more than 1000 people... a peer evaluation. Of course, you may say that this is more impressionistic, but still that's a group of more than 1000 people commenting on the top universities of the world; that would be quite viable, because reputation does not happen suddenly..."(HKR2).

He explained that this awareness of the positive impact of international students and staff on the THES index reinforced the faculty's interest in this area. The Institute of Hong Kong had always had an international flavour, and the history of student enrolment revealed an increasing proportion of international students, particularly since the development of post graduate studies from the 1980's. There will be more detail regarding this feature in a later section.

League tables were also reinforcing the faculty's interest in the area of research. As we have seen, not only had the university set up a number of strategic research themes, but

the Dean had also launched a faculty research programme, of which there will be further details in a section below.

7.4 Research findings: Practice within the Faculty

7.4.1 The Dean's Style of Management

The Dean suggested that he perceived his role, since his appointment in 2006, in a different light to the role of previous deans of the faculty, and that perhaps that role suited a rather different personality:

> "I think there has been a step change here. For two reasons, I'm employed under a different rubric... I'm an appointed Dean, my predecessor was elected, and as it happens I'm a much more activist character, he was very mellow... a three year Deanship made sense in the past, probably, they were not so aggressive, not so active, there was not so much competition...all you were doing was managing, rather than directing and strategising and policy making an all of that" (HKR1).

He explained that because the role was now *strategic* as well as managerial, the longer tenure was necessary:

> "The problem is that if you only have a 3 year term as Dean, then it's too short a time to implement anything before the next guy comes along to re-brand the faculty... so I guess if you try to create a brand like this you mustn't change it every year or two... you have to stick with it. Pretty much the first thing I did, coming in, I had two retreats in my first semester (2006), first to throw out some ideas, then to try to bring them back down to earth, try to assemble a strategy going forward" (HKR1).

This new strategic role entailed driving the faculty in certain directions:

> "There has been a system change... now I am generally galvanizing the faculty... you know five, ten years ago, it would have been inconceivable for a Dean to initiate the kind of projects we're now involved in" (HKR1).

One strand of the 'branding' of the faculty involved two central ideas which were intended to cut across all student experience:

> "We've tried to brand the faculty with this whole Social Innovation and Global Citizenship projects. We attach these to everything we do, for example the summer school programme (which tours Asia), is couched in terms of Global Citizenship, and this year's first year will have to do the internship for Social Innovation. I guess what we're trying to do is be consistent across the range of faculty business" (HKR1).

The Dean was now involved in robust staff management and the change in style had ruffled feathers:

> "I think Deans are required to do quite a different job now, we have a whole staff appraisal system, annual, I oversee the whole thing, I see each form, I reward salary increments on that basis, I step in, in some cases... there are appeals... I am the first executive Dean... there is

bound to be a period of transition where people are getting used to a new mode of operation in the Deanship..." (HKR1).

A further feature of the branding of the faculty has involved the creation of a faculty-wide research project, which will be examined in a section below.

7.4.2 The Significance of, and Strategies for Building a Reputation

With regard to building reputation, the respondents at IoHK identified the personal and institutional reasons behind particular projects, whilst being aware of the limitations of their efforts:

> "...there's local, regional, and international reputation, you see for us, building a regional reputation is not actually that much of an issue, because its there already. And building an international reputation is an issue, it is for the campus as a whole, but it's only very marginally affected by what I do in this faculty" (HKR1).

An Assistant Dean felt that more strongly about the need to drive the faculty's visibility:

> "It is so easy to slip down, to loose places against our competitors, I know universities in Asia which are going backwards, we have to be active..." (HKR2)

The Dean analysed his motivation for a particular research project as that of reputation building:

> "Well, it probably wasn't... (hesitation)... yeah, I guess it was, in many ways, it probably was the number one motivation for us going down that road. Why is it that a Dean launches a major international collaborative research programme, why not just let colleague's just get on with their research, and be happy and get on with it, so long as they do a certain amount, what more is there to be said. One of the reasons why we did this was to align ourselves with some great global universities, and make a splash in HK..." (HKR1).

He explained how the project had helped visibility:

> "The (name of project) Initiative with (name of London College) and (name of a university in New York), that builds our reputation locally because the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) launched the programme, the first time a CEO of Hong Kong has done that, that was fantastic, in terms of the political buy in, the community buy in, that was huge, and so we are interested how that reflected on us, how that built our reputation..." (HKR1).

A further project which the Dean hoped would enhance reputation was the construction of an entirely new Social Science building, but importantly this would tie in with a vision to develop research activities in a particular direction:

> "The buildings are in a pretty bad way here. So there is a new (name) campus, adjacent to here. We are one of the three faculties moving over there in 2012. We are isolated now, by which I mean departments are all over the campus, but when we move over there we will be together,

> that will be a big change... the new building... it will help with reputation, but the key thing is that it will enable better internal communications" (HKR1).

The enhanced communications would help in the Dean's strategy of encouraging closer research links between departments.

7.4.3 The Research Culture

An already highly developed research culture was being further honed at IoHK to include tighter expectations of faculty staff and encouragement towards greater inter-disciplinary projects. Faculty staff were also expected to make contributions to both faculty and university wide research programmes, though the Dean was keen to point out that all faculty staff were expected to teach. He outlined a system he had instigated aimed at encouraging research and facilitating research funding: a round table, collegiate style workshop, where juniors were advised by more senior colleagues. Additionally, targets were set for both quantity and venue of research output at an annual Professional Review:

> "Venue is very important, a US journal is preferred... normally there is 3 year strategy... maybe 4 pieces in indexed journals out of Hong Kong" (HKR1).

Alongside these carrots and targets was the development towards cross discipline research, though these were not without their problems:

> "To say, this is an inter-disciplinary research initiative which all of the Departments can contribute to, this is quite a new departure, it has not been seen at IoHK before, and it's quite hard when you are relying on good will to mobilise people" (HKR1).

The Assistant Dean insisted that this research style was important:

> "I believe we are living in a new regime now, interdisciplinary collaboration, this is the order of the day" (HKR2).

Research students in the faculty were also included in the overall strategy: an annual, international conference was well established, and generously supported by private donations. A further element of the Dean's research strategy was faculty-led collaborations with other institutions, collaborations which he had personally initiated:

> "Last month I was in the States and had meetings with five universities and out of that we'll have real things happening... for example a university in New York are going to join us in this 'urban' project... it means that I can mobilise teams here, and the same will happen in our partner institutions in the US and the UK... this four year programme will happen" (HKR1).

As we have seen, IoHK has recently (2008) instituted its own Strategic Research Themes (SRT's), and the Faculty of Social Science is currently co-chairing two of the areas:

> "We responded positively to the university call for SRTs , we bid to co-chair the themes 'Contemporary China' and 'Law, Development and Policy'. We have 19 SRTs (here at the university). We (the Dean and I) want to make use of these... as enabling framework for providing a good pattern for colleagues to collaborate" (HKR2). .

The issues associated with such changes, that is, issues related to further 'top-down' research, also emerged in the context of the SRTs:

> "But colleagues don't seem to have much energy for this. Just like at (name of a university known to both respondent and writer), staff are very individual; they set out their research and don't bother about collaboration..." (HKR2).

The Dean confirmed that these new directions were affecting the existing structures within the faculty:

> "You see, the faculty research centres are tailing off, it seems pointless... its hard to mobilise colleagues, there is resistance, research takes a lot of time....."(HKR1).

7.4.4 Internationalisation and Stratification

IoHK has had an international outlook since inception. This feature of the university continues to deepen, and appears to be becoming a strategic element rather than organic. A respondent summarised the geographic change:

> "10 years ago, it was only English-speaking countries - but now we go all the way out, to Europe (France and Germany, for example) and especially with Asia (Japan, PRC, Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, etc.)" (HKR3).

As we have seen, the concept of 'Global Citizenship' is faculty-led: one of the physical expressions of this is the identification each semester of a national theme: images, flags, and posters of the chosen culture festoon the corridors of the faculty. This is partly driven by a traditional liberal education rationale, as suggested by the Dean, and partly by twenty-first century motives; the wider internationalisation of the faculty is encouraged by outside influences:

> "Two indicators of the Times THES rank are about whether there are international students and international staff. In these respects Hong Kong is not too bad, and particularly IoHK is getting

> better in terms in international students. So we have to perform to a standard and internationalisation is part of that" (HKR2).

IoHK does well regarding the metrics of internationalisation. All teaching is conducted in English, there is a global search for all staff appointments; staff are supported to travel to conferences; funds were available to invite visiting professors to stay for a semester or two; all undergraduates will soon spend a semester outside Hong Kong; and there is an increasing number of international students (HKR1). Regarding the latter, an Assistant Dean explained that closer links with the Mainland had brought about a quota system for undergraduates, a quota which was to rise up to 20% of undergraduate numbers by 2014 (HKR2). The advance to this percentage was happening rather more quickly than had been planned, and the positive impact on the THES index was quoted as one reason as to why there were few complaints. It should be noted here that the league table in question considered student exchange between Hong Kong and the PRC as 'international'.

The choice of international partners emerged as a further element of the Dean's strategy, which overlapped with that of IoHK:

> "So this week the VC is leading a delegation to the West coast of the states, and in October he'll be leading a delegation to the East coast of the states... so I'll join the East Coast trip... so the 10 deans will go to the states and one or two others from senior management and all that is about an attempt to spread the message. It'll be the 'good' schools - UC Berkeley, UBL in Vancouver and UCLA - trying to say 'we're in the same league as you guys, we want to be good friends with you... and on the East coast it'll be Harvard, Yale, Princeton if we can..." (HKR1).

The Dean noted that his future engagement with international collaborators would be informed by league tables:

> "I guess we wouldn't look outside the top 200 as defined by Times Higher for partners. It's been a huge bonus for us, the ranking. 'Oh, you're a top 200 university'. People take note. I think it's very helpful" (HKR1).

7.4.5 Teaching, Student Feedback and a Client-based Culture

My respondents expressed the view that student experience of teaching and learning at IoHK is as one would expect in a *Western* university. By this they meant that there was a mix of lecture hall presentations and smaller group seminars, usually incorporating 'power point' style visuals, and increasingly, peer presentations, discussion groups and problem solving exercises (HKR1, HKR2). Added to this was the experiential learning that a compulsory seminar 'out of Hong Kong' internship or study period that all undergraduates (who registered in 2010) and onwards, would soon be enjoying.

The Dean explained that in the context of Hong Kong, this latter initiative would 'add-value' to the students' résumés:

> "But of course there is a huge value put on international education in that many still do go abroad, the elite, they send their kids to UK/US/Aus, it gives us a platform for saying those who come here should go away for a semester... it goes with the grain... and if you have a IoHK student with half a year at Warwick or half a year at Sydney, it starts to make sense... it's much valued by students and parents, upgrading their CVs, giving them a veneer of cosmopolitanism, sometimes just a veneer, but sometimes much deeper, it can be life-changing" (HKR1).

Regarding student feedback of teaching, the faculty runs a system whereby 'student evaluation of teaching scores' (s.e.t.s) are collected for each course taught. These would be used more rigorously in the near future:

> "We are moving to a system where all 5 of (the lecturers') courses are monitored... at the moment a lecturer can select just three. I see it thro' the professional review process.... the s.e.t.'s (student evaluation scores) will come up on my screen... in the future, say two years time, all 5 will come up. If someone is not up to standard, we work with them, elders mentor them, else but if all fails, contracts are not renewed" (HKR1)

Referring to my query as to whether a client-based culture was developing, the respondents felt that traditional Chinese attitudes to learning were alive and well; this translated into a continuation of the respectful, sometimes close relationship between student and teacher. This factor, together with faculty staff who generally acted in a highly professional manner, meant that there were few problems in the area of staff/student relationships.

7.4.6 Concluding Comments

The respondents at IoHK saw themselves in a context of local, regional and global competition; there was great awareness of the arrival of global league tables, and a willingness to acknowledge their significance. The faculty has been involved in substantial reorganisation during the last five years; there appeared to be a shift in management styles towards more direction and steering of faculty members, through increased monitoring of research and teaching activities. The Dean was actively seeking to enhance the reputation of the faculty with, for example, a faculty-wide research programme, and engagement with universities across the world of a similar status.

The study now moves to a contextual analysis of HE in Taiwan.

Chapter 8. The Institute of Taiwan: Contexts and Findings

This chapter examines the context in which the IoT developed, and the findings from the empirical part of the study.

8.1 Introduction

Situated off the east coast of mainland China, and separated from it by the Taiwan Strait, Taiwan is about the size of the Netherlands (32,260km). Occupied by a variety of 'aborigine' groups, it was first colonised by the Dutch in 1624, who turned it into a colony and a meeting place for Dutch, Chinese and Japanese traders. The Qin (the dynastic rulers of that period) defeated the colonisers in 1662 and a long period of Chinese rule followed, though that rule may have been more effective in the few towns rather than in the mountainous interior, where the many aforementioned tribes of the Malayo-Polynesian indigenous peoples had more sway.

The Japanese were ceded the island following hostilities between Japan and China in the 1890s: we might interpret this as the first manifestation of Japan's colonial ambitions. Those ambitions were to drag many parts of Asia into a twentieth century war, which resulted in the stripping away of Japan's territorial expansion in 1945. Taiwan was amongst the many locations which changed sovereignty at the time; it was returned to the Republic of China (ROC), the political entity which had succeeded the Qin (Fenby 2008). Soon afterwards, this situation became very complex (see below), and was to shape the island's political future until the present time.

With the Chinese Communist Party's victory in the civil war on the mainland in 1949, the government of the ROC de-camped to Taiwan, and the island was to become a pawn in the Cold War for the 40 years that followed. Thus a small island of 20 million people became involved in big politics, shaped by the 'China factor', American - (or Western -) isation, and the global economy; meanwhile it shaped its own identity, economy, and governance systems.

8.2 The Development of HE: Political, Economic and Social Contexts

There are interesting parallels between Hong Kong and Taiwan in terms of their political, economic and social contexts. HE in Taiwan has also been shaped by its status as a colony (Japanese rather than British), its relationship with the global giants of the PRC and the US, and the attempts of the island to re-fashion itself in terms of trade and its place in the wider Asian economic community. In order to draw out some of the salient features of the development of Taiwan's HE institutions, I will use four time periods; these may provide a useful framework to view the different directions in which higher learning has moved. The first period is a part of the Qin dynasty, when the island was a part of the Imperial Chinese system. The second period, between 1895 and 1945, is the period of Japanese colonial rule; the third period represents the era of single party rule by the KMT (*Guo Ming Tang*) between 1945 and 1987; and the final period encompasses the move towards democracy to the present day. As with Hong Kong, the 'China-factor' looms large over the entirety of the developments.

8.2.1 1662 - 1895: The Qin Dynasty Period

We have seen the development of traditional Chinese higher learning systems in a previous chapter relating to the PRC. I argue that the interest in, and the attitudes to learning, at least amongst the Han, are identical with that of the mainland, emerging as they do from an identical indigenous culture.

8.2.2 1895 - 1945: The Japanese Colonial Period

Taiwan's erstwhile link with Han culture was interrupted in 1895 by the Japanese invasion, and it was during this period of occupation, refashioning and Japan-isation (in terms of language, culture and lifestyle) which lasted until 1945, that its HE system was established. At the end of that period, that is, at the end of the Second World War, this system consisted of one university, named Taihoku Imperial University, and a number of HE colleges; these institutions were at the apex of a substantial elementary and post-primary system (Wu 1964).

Naturally, the system at this time was an elite system, and very much geared to the economic aims of the colonial master: "the main purposes of HE were to provide research material and high level manpower for Japan's colonial policy" (Chen 1997: 346). 80% of the students at the university were of Japanese origin: Wu informs us that

in the judgement of the Japanese, too many educated local people might not be good for continuing their suppression (Wu 1964). Nevertheless, the KMT did inherit a substantial educational infrastructure from the Japanese, one which has been judged to have been of real value in Taiwan's continuing economic growth.

8.2.3 1945 - 1987: From Re-accession to Democratisation

At the end of this colonial period, and the retrocession to the ROC, the previously mentioned Taihoku Imperial University was renamed National Taiwan University, and Mandarin was adopted as the language of the lecture hall and the classroom throughout the island. Following the arrival of the national government from the Mainland, centralisation became a key feature of the HE system, and "almost every policy regarding HE was made by the government" (Chen, 1997: 348); this was, after all, a "totalitarian state" (Mok 2006:152). It is not too fanciful to compare the nature of this central control of education to that of the PRC: after all, the Ministry of Education, which had been established in Republican China in 1928 to oversee all levels of education on the mainland, was simply transplanted to Taiwan with the arrival of the KMT in 1945. Not only did the state assume power to supervise all educational institutions, but those institutions became integral to national economic and manpower development, and indeed to the concept of nation building (Li 2005: 193). This 'totalitarianism', of course, did not apply only to the field of education; there is much literature devoted to the notion of the 'developmental state' in East Asia. The determination of the KMT is matched by other descriptors used in the literature: repressive, corrupt, authoritarian and intrusive are but some of the adjectives used. Moral perspectives aside, the KMT modus operandi certainly contributed to the stability of the island for the fifty-five years that it was in continuous power.

This period is characterised by the bitter contest about sovereignty with the PRC (see, for example, Fenby 2008), a contest which has not yet been resolved. Throughout the Cold War period, most intense in the 1950s and 1960s, the island was under threat of invasion from the PRC and of isolation from the international community (Bellows 1976). With reversals in U.S. policy in 1971, Taiwan was forced out of the United Nations, and disconnected from UN associates such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Epstein and Kuo 1991). Wherever sovereignty was a pre-condition for participation, Taiwan was usually excluded. The PRC attempted to isolate

Taiwan from the international community (Bellows 1976, Fenby 2008: 501). The KMT in turn were committed to the "Three No's Policy": no contacts, no negotiation, and no compromise: it was not until the early 1990s that this approach began to soften (Boyd and Lee 1995). Despite the difficulties, Taiwan was able to develop, maintain and strengthen unofficial yet wholly productive links with many nations during this period (Li 2005: 198).

Associated with the animosity with the PRC were the close links with the United States, which originated at the time of the Korean War, when U.S. missiles were stationed in Taiwan (Fenby 2008). From that point, the U.S. had much influence in the island, particularly in the areas of defence, macro-economics and education. Taiwan became a willing partner of American foreign policy and the island served as a key strategic military base, part of the ring of US muscle which surrounds the PRC. There continues to be male military conscription in Taiwan, with the major supplier of hardware coming from its erstwhile Western ally.

In terms of economic orientation, American influence is seen as a key factor in explaining the current situation: Taiwan received $1.5 billion of economic aid between 1951 and 1965; American views on free trade, industrialisation and a policy of outward-looking, export-led economic growth were paramount in shaping the island's future (Bello and Rosenfeld 1992: 4). Though American aid petered out in the 1960s and 1970s, it is judged to have been crucial to the consolidation of the KMT political regime on the island and to the foundations of this 'Tiger' or 'Dragon' economy.

In HE, the 'American factor' is also very evident. There was already a strong influence from the US system before the MOE migrated from the mainland to Taiwan, and the influence was to grow; such elements as a strong presence of private institutions, organisational patterns, study period, curriculum, degree structure and the emphasis on science and technology were all directs imports. Regarding private institutions, the die was cast as early as 1956, when private providers were first welcomed, but always under strict the control of the MOE. These providers grew to supply more than a half of the student places by the late 1990s. American influence had other significant implications; the literature sees both a 'brain-drain' of an elite who were familiar with the 'parent' system, and an unconscious 'cultural imperialism' on the part of those who returned to run the HEIs (Li 2005).

This was a period of extraordinary growth of HEIs, and the costs of all public universities were met by the government. By the end of the period, there were twenty-eight institutions, by which time the sector was well on the way to moving towards massification. We should view this growth of HE as part of the managed economy, with HEIs as overtly human capital instruments. This manpower strategy saw training and HE as integral elements of a greater economic plan[38]; one consequence of a successful economy was the development of a middle-class, who in turn created a demand for HE. However, Li makes the point that though HEIs were engaged in some scholarly exchanges during this period, they were more constrained in their approach to internationalisation than some neighbouring states: 'Taiwan had less room (in this period) to internationalise its universities than, for example, Hong Kong or Singapore....with regard to teaching staff and curriculum...because of a need to maintain national culture and foster a certain political ideology' (Li 2005: 201).

Economically, Taiwan re-fashioned itself during this period, as global circumstances changed. In the early 1970s, the oil-crisis hit hard; in the late 1970s, the island drew competition from ASEAN countries and a post-Mao China, eager to adopt export-led industrialisation policies, and Taiwan began to lose its cost advantages. Businesses relocated their manufacturing operations to locations where production was cheaper: preferred destinations for investment included Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand (Hughes 2007: 18). As a consequence, the decision was made to upgrade its economic structure from labour intensive to capital and technology intensive: continued strong government eased the process. In the early 1980s, the plan for the nation to act as a service-rich hub for the wider Asia-Pacific region, with Taipei as a 'world city', first emerged (ibid), perhaps aping other Asian centres such as Singapore. Education in general and HE in particular, were to play a central role in these policies.

8.2.4 1987 - Present

---

[38] College admissions were adjusted in line with the speed of expansion in different fields and the government successfully increased the number of students enrolled onto science subjects during the 1970s and 1980s (Chen, 1997:349).

The 40-year period of KMT martial law came to an end in 1987 and marked the beginning of a process of 'democratisation' and 'Taiwan-isation' (Mok 2006b). By the 1990s, Taiwan was one of the fastest growing economies of the world, having moved, as we have seen, towards the development of high-tech industries: it was now recognised as one of the 'Asian miracles' by the World Bank (Li 2005: 190). All of this progress must be seen in the context of continuing difficulties with the PRC: in the mid-1990s, only 28 countries had formal ties with Taiwan (Yeh 1995) and the political rhetoric and crises between the 'two Chinas' continued. Some commentators suggest that security continued to be of paramount importance in the 1990s, with 40% of the national budget going to defence, and the resulting pressures on other public services such as education (Sung 1995).

Nevertheless, HEIs in Taiwan have gone through rapid expansion since the early 1990s (Table 1). The revised Universities Act of 1994 heralded major changes in many areas of HE: for example, the bureaucratic exam-based entry system was replaced with an entrance-by-application system. Chen and Lo assert that the government continued the neo-liberal approach and encouraged the growth of private universities to supply increasing demand (Chen & Lo 2007: 166): the new Act allowed a 20% government subsidy for all private HEIs. However, the Act also brought about a shift away from full government support of public HEIs, who were instructed to find 20% of their own annual budgets.

It was in this period that the debate regarding a possible over-emphasis on science and technology within Taiwanese HE took shape: anxiety was expressed that future generations would lack traditional values, a Chinese identity, and 'statecraft', and that these absences would undermine Taiwanese legitimacy. From this point, there has been a rebalancing of priorities in favour of Humanities and Social Sciences, expressed in a variety of MOE targets and objectives (Li 2005: 201).

The number of HEIs has risen in 2005 to 162; however, Chen points out that there are some difficulties in defining HE in Taiwan because of the complexity of the institutions, and particularly because of the role of the 'junior college', an institution which crosses the secondary-tertiary divide. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there are now more private institutions than public, and that these private institutions admit the majority of students; however, greater prestige always lay with the public institutions. Importantly,

this has changed the social mix of those attending those institutions; no longer, Mok claims, are universities the preserve of the Han middle-class male (Mok 2006: 155). It should also be noted that a falling birth rate and a declining youthful population have now reversed the clamour for entry into HEIs to the point where some universities are under the threat of closure, or at least of radical re-organisation (Li, 2008).

Table 4

Numbers of Colleges and Universities in Taiwan since 1966

Year	Total
1966	21
1971	23
1976	25
1981	27
1986	28
1991	50
1996	67
2001	135
2005	162

(Source: Chen 2006)

Since the move towards democracy, the Taiwanese government has responded to demands for greater autonomy within HEIs, also reflected in the Universities Act of 1994. Chen provides a translation of a critical point, which reads: "The university is protected by academic freedom and is entitled to institutional autonomy with the sole limit of the laws" (Chen, 1997: 350). The Act instigated many governance reforms: Mok cites the consultations before the elections of presidents, the emergence of student

representatives, the establishment of associations of university teachers, and revised procedures for the engagement of staff as evidence of change (Mok 2006b: 157). However, Chen & Lo's analysis questions the extent of the turn to autonomy and points to new 'evaluation regulations' which came into effect in 2007 (Chen & Lo op.cit: 175). They interpret this recent re-regulation and re-centralisation as a continuation of the notion of the developmental state in East Asia (Chen & Lo op.cit: 178), where the government has re-asserted that "education is an important instrument for maintaining national competitiveness in the global economy" (ibid: 178). As in Hong Kong, it seems that the development needs of the island are regarded by ministers as paramount, and appear to take precedence over all other considerations; HE continues to be an instrument of the master economic plan.

In order to understand the reasons behind this policy, we should remind ourselves of the socio-economic and socio-political contexts in which Taiwan finds itself; many of these contexts are driving policy in the same direction. Politically, there is an overarching need to remain firmly within the international community, so as not to be 'side-lined' by the continually-growing presence of the mainland. Additionally, there is the need to control expenditure in an environment of increasing public expectations; externally, there are the pressures from globalisation. Taiwan must respond in order to make its economy as competitive as possible, both regionally and globally (Mok 2006b:156). As observed above, a theme of economic planning is to foster a services-rich hub, taking advantage of its central location within the Asia-Pacific area. With regards to HE, these pressures have resulted in the chosen policy options of massification and autonomisation, and also of restructuring, with the concomitant redefining of the relationship between state and the education sector (Chen & Lo 2007: 166, Mok 2006b:170). These pressures have also resulted in the policy to internationalise HE, particularly after the country's accession into the WTO in 2002 (Chen & Lo 2007: 166): we should note that Taiwan is allowed entry here because sovereignty is not a requirement. It is for this same reason that Taiwan has been able to figure in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation organisation (APEC), which itself has a significant HE section.

A number of policies emerging from the MOE in the past decade have aimed at making Taiwanese universities more globally competent (Mok op.cit: 157). In 1998, there was the Education Reform Action Plan; in 2001 the first phase of the Programme for

Increasing Competitiveness of Taiwanese Universities was announced (Chen & Lo op.cit: 169), followed in 2002 by the Integration Plan of Research Type Universities, which aimed to create competitiveness by merging HEIs into more effective and efficient organizations. Only by pooling their resources, the MOE believed, could Taiwanese universities achieve global or regional quality research (Mok 2006b: 171). In the years that followed, there were further phases of the Programme for Increasing Competitiveness of Taiwanese Universities; the phase announced in 2003 aimed at supporting the improvement of the acquisition of English not only as a medium of instruction, but widely within HEIs. Mok provides a number of examples where faculty members are rewarded and encouraged to conduct classes in English, where students are required to pass English tests in order to graduate, where English is used in the administration processes, and where student exchange programmes are organised (Mok 2006b: 171).

Mok also describes other measures to internationalise, among which is the need to benchmark its universities against international standards. One associated measure involves a categorisation, or 'differentiation exercise', of each institution into one of four groups: comprehensive, research, teaching or vocational (Mok 2006b: 171). Once again, one can see the process of stratification emerging, which seems to be inherently linked to the quest for quality. But perhaps the most significant policy which has emerged regarding international competition is the Aiming for Top University project (ATU): thus, the Vice Minister of Education Lu Mu-lin made the following ambitious announcement in 2003:

> "The Ministry would like at least one of its universities to be ranked among the top 100 leading international institutions of HE within the next ten years, and to have between ten and fifteen research centres or academic fields recognised as world-class, within five years" (Chen & Lo op.cit: 169).

International competition was certainly a key factor in the formulation of the ATU plan: "2005 saw the implementation of development plans for key universities in neighbouring countries, Taiwan's Ministry of Education formulated and instituted its Aim for the Top University Project" (ATU: 6). It is against the backdrop of this ambition that we now turn to the detail of the case study institution and the findings from the interviews at that location.

8.2.5 Institutional and Faculty Context

The institution chosen, henceforth referred to as the Institute of Taiwan (IoT), is the HEI which was chosen by the MoE to be the flagship of the move to improve quality in the sector: it is the institution which has been designated by the MoE to be ranked among those top 100 universities (see above). What distinguishes this institution, then, is that it has been singled out for a particular mission, a particular project: it is a distinctive project, and the project has been pursued in distinctive ways, as the following discussion will show. I argue that there has been a re-tooling of governance to achieve this aim.

Since its inception, the IoT has grown into an institution with 30,000 students in 11 Colleges (or faculties). It is headed by a President, who is served by three vice-presidents; there are three 'Offices' headed by 'super-Deans', who are responsible for the particular strategy areas of research, administration and fundraising respectively. The Colleges are headed by Deans, and the Departments headed by Chairs, though in this study they are referred to as Heads of Departments (HODs). The President is advised by a senate consisting of 166 members of the university, the majority of whom are professors, elected from the various Colleges. There is a core group within this senate consisting of Deans and those in the hierarchy above the level of Dean (TR1, TR10).

The structure outlined above represents the 'democratisation' following the 1994 University Act. Alongside this structure is the system of election of the President:

> "This university will nominate 2 people to be president of the university, following a series of elections, and the MoE will finally appoint one to be the president" (TR2).

Corporatisation, by which I mean greater strategic and financial autonomy for the institution, is still under consideration, as it is for all universities in Taiwan.

> "The Ministry of Education just published a paper saying there were a lot of hurdles (to corporatisation). It's a hot topic, and the IoT is the role model for everything in Taiwan. Four years ago, we had a new president; he conducted close, deep research into corporatisation, collected information from different universities across the globe. After this research, talk slowed down a bit, especially with the global financial crisis. I visited Japan to learn and listen; after corporatisation, the government reduced the budget by 1% per year... in Japan. So we are rather hesitant. So we not yet autonomous; we are still under very strict control from Ministry" (TR1).

Regarding the College of Social Sciences, the Dean is appointed by the president. There are four departments: Political Science, Economics, Sociology and Social work; and two graduate Institutes: National Development and Journalism.

I now present the research findings for the IoT.

8.3. Research Findings: the Faculty within the Wider Environment

At IoT, I was fortunate enough to have access to four Deans: here they are identified by College or Office to allow the reader to understand their perspective.

8.3.1 A Context of Competition

In their conversations with me, my respondents in Taiwan made frequent reference to the global competitive environment. In general terms, they saw competition as something they could not avoid, but which was a struggle in which they were often at a disadvantage. In particular, the 'China Factor' and resources were often mentioned as major problems.

There was a general acceptance that the university system both at IoT and in Taiwan in general was locked into the US and into a global system, though this acceptance came with some degree of weariness and negativity:

> "... as a small island, we need to keep up or we will not survive...we need to move on at a fast pace "(TR1).
>
> "Some people complain about the US model. But it's our responsibility to adjust the model to fit our local conditions. So an idea from another country is just a good idea; we have to adapt it to fit here" (TR7).
>
> "We're forced to adapt... we have no option but to change so we are in touch with the world's developments... actually, I feel very negatively about that, although I am involved in it" (TR3).

A Dean at IoT summarised the situation regarding the mainland, revealing her frustration at Taiwan's political marginalisation, which required her to work harder:

> "... culturally we have strong affinity to China, still we are now so different from Chinese people, politically, philosophically... (But since) the 1980s, all the Western world goes to China to seek for collaboration or send students there. Not only in the aspect of research, internationalisation or teaching, we are much better than China, but everyone goes there for international collaboration. We are by-passed. There are practical hurdles, for example, we are not a member of the UN. I have travelled abroad four times in the last month – I have to do this, whereas China doesn't... Harvard, MIT go to universities like Zhejiang, not to IoT. I have to fight for Taiwan as well as for IoT" (TR1).

Another respondent underlined the fact that whatever faculty staff achieved with regards to competing with the mainland, it was always subject to government policy, which was rapidly and unpredictably changing:

> "They are strong competitors... in the sense that the world is looking at the mainland and co-operating with them for free... so that works against us, but we do have a good relationship with a number of (PRC) departments... whether the interaction will develop, into what shape, what form, I cannot think about it, but it will develop... we just have to think about quality, our environment. But relationships with the mainland are a national choice, depending on our political masters! I can't predict how that will go over the next 10 years!" (TR4).

The current situation, where Taiwanese/PRC HE qualifications were not mutually recognised, was lamented by some:

> "I think the PRC will become a major partner for our university... (because of the new president, you know[39])... but at the moment there is no accreditation... we have links with 600 partners in the Mainland" (TR2).

Comparisons with other locations were made by some respondents to illuminate the situation in Taiwan:

> "You see, I'm from Hong Kong, not from here. In Hong Kong we see foreigners everywhere, I mean in the universities... we should be more like that...Taiwan and IoT, you see, we haven't given it sufficient resources, not like Tokyo, number one in Asia" (TR4).

And with regards to resources, there was agreement that one specific difficulty in Taiwan was remuneration, though this was balanced by other advantages:

> "That's the most difficult part! (Laughing). There's competition from other universities in East Asia, Hong Kong, Korea, Japan - the pay here in Taiwan is modest, so it is difficult to attract scholars. But we attract them by IoT's reputation. There is good networking in the IoT with other places, so it's a good base for research. So if you want to do research in Taiwan and other parts of East Asia, this is a good place" (TR4).

8.3.2. A Context of Organisational Change

At IoT, I observed a great deal of organisational change, though the academic building blocks of College and Department had not altered in the previous decade. I quote from an IoT website:

> "The number of organizational units has been reduced from 379 to 167. The university - also in coordination with the development of university affairs - added, adjusted and merged organizational units with the organizational levels of evaluation units. For instance, the Research and Development Committee has been renamed the Office of Research and Development (ORD)

---

[39] President Ma was elected in April 2008 and has pursued a policy of greater cooperation with the PRC: it is now more likely that the PRC and Taiwan may recognise each others' HE qualifications.

> and the Centre for International Academic Exchanges has been elevated to the Office of International Affairs (OIA)" (IoT)

Alongside these adjustments, two elements were very evident as vectors of change: firstly, there is a tradition of centralisation going back to the Institution's inception. This tradition of centralisation has continued, or perhaps more accurately, has fluctuated. I would argue that this centralisation slackened with the democratic movement following 1987, but has intensified in the twenty-first century with the perceived need to deepen reputation and reach for greater quality in HE. Another element which is still present is the level of bureaucratic control which is a function of co-ordinated government and Ministry of Education planning.

What has deepened in the last five years is the influence of offices at IoT outside of the College (which I interpret as faculty), in particular, the Office of Research and Development, the Office of International Affairs (both mentioned in the quotation above and described as evaluation units), and the Office of General Affairs. These have been operating for some decades, albeit under different names, but have been re-invigorated by extra resources and personnel in order to develop a particular project, namely "to be recognised as a top-rate research university…and to join the ranks of the world's top 100 in five to ten years, being at the pinnacle of the Chinese world" (IoT website). IoT, then, is the HEI chosen by Vice-Minister of Education Lu Mu-lin (above) to represent Taiwan's ambition to join the elite universities in Asia and beyond. From henceforth this project will be described here as the ATU project (Aiming for Top University).

This fascinating project is complex; it attempts to integrate the various elements which are perceived to be needed for full implementation. Its objectives include establishing an excellent research environment and a quantitative doubling of research papers, and the project has carefully designed implementation strategies and measures, including administrative streamlining, recruit the outstanding teachers and researchers, promoting cutting-edge research, and internationalisation. In order to monitor the progress of these strategies, there are implementation, control and feedback mechanisms, and an array of time-defined targets.

Interestingly, one of my respondents in the OIA introduced herself as a government 'civil servant'. She had been deployed into her current position in 2006 in order to promote the work of the Office: her presence demonstrates the active interest of powers beyond the university. She spoke about the increased responsibilities of the OIA:

> "There has been so much change in the last three years. For example, there is a very big budget for my department and in my directorate there are now 20 staff; when I arrived there were five... There's a lot of pressure from here in IoT and from the MoE generally (TR2).

She also demonstrated the sort of pressure which her Office passed onto College Deans:

> "We have a database, which each college is supposed to contribute information to... I appreciate that academic performance is more important than any international involvement. But we do evaluate the performance of each college against certain criteria... we have some indexes for each college to follow... there is an annual evaluation on paper first, then there will be presentation. The Dean of the Office of Research and Development and the Dean of Academic Affairs will be there" (TR2).

The pressures on faculty staff emerge from the ATU project, which is driven by a desire to make positional improvements in global rankings, the subject of the section below.

8.3.3 A Context of League Tables

ATU has its foundations in global league tables. In my interviews with staff at IoT, all were aware of this fact: indeed it is hardly possible that staff should not know about this central plank of IoT's future. Most approved of the project, for a variety of reasons, or thought it was inevitable; some had great reservations.

> "We want to be on that list. *I* want to be on that list! I know we can't get in the top ten. Taiwan's not used to this chase to the top rank, just look at the campus... we need to do more" (TR4).
>
> "We need to be recognised... it's important for Taiwan" (TR2).
>
> "We benefit from this world view, you know, getting in the top 100, so we get more resources, in a sense we are beneficiaries of this... the President is very clear, he wants quality programmes, he wants more active role of our university in the world's HE market" (TR3).

In the document which explains the ATU policy and implementation planning, there is an explicit link between the perceived enhancement of IoT's reputation and its positional ranking. Since there is no globally recognised index or ranking, one method from each continent (America, Asia and Europe) is described, with a detailed analysis of where IoT currently stands in each global league table; the criteria by which the rank is constructed is also explicit:

> "The 2007 global university ranking undertaken by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Institute of Higher Education, ten universities in the cross-strait tri-region entered the top 300 universities of the world. *IoT* was ranked 172nd and at the top of these ten universities. Furthermore, in "The World's Top 200 Universities" made by England's "Times" in 2006, *IoT* was 108th in the world. *IoT* was in fact 52nd in terms of "academic reputation", yet a relative lack of resources caused *IoT* to receive lower points in other indexes, such as "student-teacher ratio" and "international faculty and number of students," resulting in the final ranking of 108... Notably, when the "Times" announced the "World's Top 100 Universities in Engineering and IT," *IoT* was ranked 61st..." (ATU: 17).

Also contained in the document are details of the strategies whereby an improved position in these ranks might be possible; for example, one strategy concerns the 'impact factor' of research papers:

> "The citation status of research papers are used in numerous evaluations (including evaluation representing America, Asia, and Europe), which shows that it is a significant indicator of a first-rate university. Yet, Table 9 and Table 13 indicate that IoT still requires more effort in this area. This is the result of Taiwanese academia emphasizing quantity and not quality and visibility in the past. If IoT is to develop into a top-rate university, it must go beyond the current norm and adopt new methods to improve the citation status of research papers" (ATU: 20).

Other strategies to enhance reputation are outlined in the document, and include measures to attract "a large number of approved outstanding teachers" (ATU: 21), "strengthen infrastructure and software and hardware environment", (ATU: 22), and "promote academic internationalisation" (ATU: 22). There is a clear resonance here with a respondent in Hazelkorn's studies reported in Chapter 3: "Reputation is achieved by becoming known – rankings are one way to achieve that..." (Hazelkorn 2007: 198).

But as indicated above, some respondents had difficulties with this process and offered critiques of the project (respectively a Deputy Dean, and faculty staff):

> "We spend a lot of money on top Nobel-rank professors to lecture for a couple of months. They do not generate a real impact on our education, they just generate points for the league tables, so we can climb the league tables, right, but the money spent doesn't really generate real benefits, they don't have time to answer our students' interview schedules, to consult with our students. I think it's despicable. I don't like the process and the values attached to that. And this is all created by those lists, those ranking lists..." (TR3).

> "I don't subscribe to this ranking system. You cannot compare oranges and apples. It heightens this crazy competition; especially between Asian universities... this is having a negative impact onHE" (TR6).

8.4 Research Findings: Practice within the Faculty

8.4.1 The Role of the Dean

The Dean of the College of Social Sciences at IoT, who was appointed in 2007, operates in a highly centralised and very bureaucratic environment. He saw his role as one of reacting to, and trying to interpret, the many demands from outside the College, in particular from the Deans of the ORD and the OIA. He implied the lines of authority went beyond IoT:

> "I don't think my role has changed from the previous Dean, but I have come along at a very busy time... most of my time is spent reacting to things, you know, like staff problems, trying to get everybody to fill in all the paper work on time. Since we have this project (that is the ATU), we have wider exposure and it needs determination from the university and from the government to promote ourselves. We are very determined to promote ourselves. But I don't have a lot of time to contribute to the direction of strategies" (TR7).

When I asked a HOD whether he had experienced much organisational change over the last five years, his reply resonated with that of the Dean:

> "Not a lot of organisational change here at the College and Department, you know, at the academic level, but the style and direction has changed a lot, not the structure" (TR5).

The Dean gave an example of how strategies were operationalised at the level of the College:

> "You see, we get ring-fenced money from the OIA. They allocate two-thirds of their budget to the colleges...the only reason I remember this is because I've just been to a meeting!..We can have our own strategies / plans for international collaboration. I receive a lot of enquiries from individual professors, departments about international conferences, going to one or holding one..." (TR7)

A further activity by the OIA was staff training:

> "OIA train a key assistant in each department how to organise an international conference... in etiquette, how to treat foreign guests, some English language, how to do an exchange programme... these are the sort of courses they give, to fit into their overall aims" (TR7).

It appeared that the ORD also was involved in the bureaucracy of the College:

> "Staff must pass departmental assessments – there's a committee, run by the ORD – which checks academic records, research records, publications etc and then passes it on to college level and then university level. The most important part is departmental level, but the college level is also quite important. It's a rigorous process I too must personally be assessed every five years for research, teaching etc. If I pass, I can get another contract for the next five years. I have to submit paperwork and be considered by a special committee – there are questions on my own performance (TR5)".

The HOD also indicated that this bureaucracy was often multi-layered:

> "We also need to pass the university assessment every five years, from the Ministry of Education...and the criteria are different! It can be confusing!" (TR5).

It was clear that some staff were over-committed at IoT, and that the efforts to raise the level of performance were causing some pain: the OIA Dean told me that she was aware of the difficulties:

> "Currently we prefer to use a qualitative approach when we are discussing targets with our academic Deans and HODs... a two years ago it was very target based...we will encourage departments to work harder, but not distress them by saying 'you are worse than that College'. You know, every Dean, every Chair is intelligent, ready to debate, whatever approach you take, there are always complaints... but it is still our Office's mission to help develop IoT" (TR1)

A deputy Dean offered a critique of what he regarded as a 'target driven culture'; again, what emerges from this piece is the degree of control at ministry and university level and the fact that the College appeared to be the locus for implementation, rather than for decision-making:

> "... but I think we have to find a way to work the right direction like this, from bottom-up, not the top-down approach where everything is driven by benchmarks, forcing people to comply; right now we have 400 overseas students, the ministry has said by 2010 we have to have 1500, so now we are all scrambling to find more overseas students... the other way is to make our undergraduate programmes really solid, really first-class and then we will attract more students, that's a bottom-up approach I think. You don't try to please people by selling them courses when you're not ready... but because of this consumption-oriented culture... this is a bad thing, bad for managers, bad for teachers..." (TR3).

8.4.2 The Significance of, and Strategies for Building a Reputation

IoT is perhaps unusual in that reputation building is an explicit and publicly-stated priority: one does not have to search for clues as to the strategies regarding reputation building; rather these strategies permeate the policies of College and offices alike, and are, as has been explained, part of an integrated project: more details will follow in the sections below relating to the research culture and internationalisation. Most College staff spoke as if they were connected to this institutional, or even national, project, and saw its benefits for IoT:

> "I care about the reputation and our vision and how our programmes are recognised by the world. We have a totally English-taught programme, we are expanding our international exchange efforts, we have 40 exchange programmes - this year we are sending out 100 students and taking in about 50 students... It's extremely important for IoT... We share the vision with the MoE, they're always there with the resources" (TR4).

> "Of course I am excited by the ATU project. From my position close to the President I can see that, even in the last couple of years, we are receiving more endowments as our reputation improves" (TR1).

A particular project which the Dean (SS) felt would enhance reputation was the construction of a new building for the College of Social Science on the main campus. This had great significance for this particular College:

> "We have been overlooked in the past... we have felt in the shadow of the sciences... but MoE has been true to its promises of putting this College (of Social Sciences) and our disciplines forward. We need to move departments closer together, you know, physically, as it is easier for research fields targeted by the College to have discussions... it will be good for interdisciplinary work" (TR7).

One issue which seemed important to some respondents was that of academic salaries: generally this was something which was seen as a 'bottleneck'[40] to reputation building. A respondent from outside the College spoke of the status quo regarding pay:

> "The professors' salaries are fixed... extra funding is outside the structure - at IoT quite a few faculty members are good at getting extra funding. I was informed that extra funding will go to professors whose papers are published in SSCI/SCI - but we will not call it part of the salary." (TR2).

Academic staff were hoping for change with respect to salaries and benefits:

> "There's competition from other universities in East Asia, Hong Kong, Korea, Japan – the pay here in Taiwan is modest, so it is difficult to attract scholars... there are no housing subsidies, but we can offer accommodation to junior scholars for the first year. For families, it depends on seniority, case by case. So if you've been here a long time, and hold a professorship, then you may get accommodation for the family, until retirement" (TR5).

The ATU Proposal document registers that IoT has achieved 'limited success due to insufficient resources and funding' with regard to attracting quality staff to the university, and that IoT 'has set up special hiring budgets from campus affairs endowments due to rigid restrictions and regulations pertaining to operating budgets for the hiring of needed teaching and research personnel'. Clearly there is a conflict here between aspiration and resource.

8.4.3 The Research Culture

As we have seen, research is a major theme of the ATU project, and as a result, research practice is changing. There are greater expectations for staff regarding research output: staff reviews are now more frequent than they were five years ago, and there is encouragement to aim towards 'high-impact' journals. Encouragement towards interdisciplinary projects is also evident at IoT.

---

[40] I use the word from ATU Proposal.doc: 31

An HOD in the College of Social Sciences outlined what he considered to be the most significant recent changes:

> "The most important change has been that five years ago, all were individual... you know, all research proposals were submitted by individuals to the National Science (Research) Council, you struggled for funding, and then you did your research! Now, there is much focus on teamwork – we are organised as research teams – so there is a focus on a topic for international publication. We found that if we want to expand our research capacity, we cannot do it by individual efforts, we need to assemble a team, and not just of IoT members; the team will include members outside NTU, even outside Taiwan" (TR5).

The Dean (SS) indicated that research needed to fit into IoT's overall strategy, and that inter-disciplinary proposals were more likely to succeed. He pointed out that key research directions had been identified for the College: these included research on globalisation, East Asian democratic studies, and regional research emphasising Taiwan Studies and China Studies:

> "Resources are limited within the faculty, so we do need to compete with each other. Successful proposals will be according to our development plans, and also we need to decide which would benefit the university as a whole. So we have collaboration with other colleges, for example, the college of Public Health" (TR7).

The HOD insisted that the major focus of research activity was at the level of the Department:

> "Most research work is focused in departments. For example, we research on social exclusion and trauma and recovery, a more psychological approach. Disaster trauma and is an important issue in East Asia (because of earthquakes in Japan, China etc.) So this is a departmental target, not a college target" (TR5).

The bureaucratic nature of organisation at IoT, the interconnections with those designated as drivers of change, and the top-down nature of the strategic direction, were also commented on by the Dean (SS):

> "As a top research institution, you know, that's the main target of NTU, to become a world-class institution – we need to check our own performance every 3 months. Each member of the college staff has to present a report – how many public journals they have published in, etc – a fixed form goes to every member of the department, who has to fill it in and pass it to the HOD, then to me at the College, then onto the Office of Research and Development. It's a paper report, not a face to face review" (TR7).

One might expect that issues would arise following this top-down approach. A deputy Dean was rather outspoken about these issues:

> "I've lost some of my interest in research, because of the definition of research, meaning you have to write papers based on the specification dictated by the profession, right? You have to go through an assembly line, write a paper with enough quotations and footnotes, you don't have to have real partners, so I react negatively, right... if I had more time I would write poetry; this would just suit my soul. There are so many useless papers floating around, nobody reads them once they're published" (TR3).

He associated the problems above with wider issues:

> "That's one of the problems of these league tables... part of the number is generated by the papers count and if I don't produce those papers, then I jeopardise my career here but I would prefer to write about how I am in touch with my emotions, my culture. I'm concerned about this research business...." (TR3).

8.4.4 Internationalisation and Stratification

IoT's involvement with the process of internationalisation has become a strategic issue, and one which is influenced by the MOE. We have already seen that the OIA has grown considerably over the last five years. A respondent in the OIA summarised the top-down nature of the interest in internationalisation:

> "... about five years ago – internationalisation became very important. So the president decided to make it a priority... we didn't have that many international guests and the university wasn't demanding a lot from us. Then the MoE had a project –in 2005/6 – to recruit more international students. Our MoE plays an important role, because they are the grand founder, they set the policy and the restrictions. They have different divisions, and we work with the International Education Division. They have regulations we have to follow – we can apply for funding from the MoE to invite international scholars" (TR2).

Nevertheless, IoT does not currently do well with regard to the metrics of internationalisation; hence the perceived need to improve. Thus there are specified goals to increase the numbers of international students, of exchange students, of international conferences, of long-term visits of foreign scholars, of international co-operation projects, and the participation rate in international academic organisations (ATU doc:87). The Dean of Social Sciences summarised the somewhat 'managerial' methods used to achieve the strategic aims:

> "We have some indices for the College to follow, for example, how many international students there are; we must have, for example, enough English courses and enough manpower to take care of them. We will be evaluated on how many faculty members we sponsored for international conferences. This annual evaluation is on paper first, then a presentation. The Dean of Research Development and the Dean of Academic Affairs will be there" (TR7).

Increasing the visibility of IoT was one of the purposes of the internationalisation project:

> "You see, when our leaders are abroad they offer IoT as a host institution (for international conferences), wherever they are. It has become more hectic in the last three years. We got a lot of enquiries about what they should do in order to run more conference" (TR2).

The Dean (SS) indicated that a number of international conferences had been taken place at the College with the assistance of the OIA, and that the OIA had also funded an International Lounge:

> "You see, we don't have a lot of experience here (in the College). The OIA has assisted with some conferences... they've provided the funds, and the personnel... they've had training over the last three years to do this... and they are training some of our administrators in those skills..." (TR7).
>
> "They also created a very comfortable space, a lounge with many facilities, for use by our small number of international students... anyone can use it, but the rule is, you have to speak English there! It's very popular... OIA are providing each College with one" (TR7).

There was agreement that these policies, and the manner of their implementation, were likely to intensify the stratification of universities. Though this was unsettling to some, it would be advantageous to IoT: my respondents spoke about top universities in Asia (such as Kyoto, Osaka, Hong Kong University, Beijing, Shanghai, Nanjing and Guangzhou) in our conversations about various co-operative projects.

> "It's an M shaped society; rich at one end, poor at the other; the middle class disappears. I think that universities are now M shaped. But IoT is in a good situation; many other universities can't get donations or funding. For example, last month I was in Australia with the APRU (the Association of Pacific Rim Universities), IoT is the only one from Taiwan. Other universities came to me and want collaboration, such as over the new cancer research centre here" (TR1).

Again, there was one respondent who provided a general critique regarding the internationalising agenda, and a swipe at the Anglo-managerial world:

> "You people in the UK are missing the point... you do not send your students to our country to study. This is a conflict. If you realise the value of globalisation, then why don't you put more pressure on students to study abroad? That's the only value that globalisation can bring to universities... So students can broaden their horizons" (TR3).

8.4.5 Teaching, student feedback and a client-based culture

My respondents at IoT expressed the idea that teaching styles were moving in the direction of that which one might find in a Western university; a HOD in Social Sciences suggested that this was a societal change rather than a strategy:

> "The pressure for department members is mostly from research, but we also need to change our teaching style; the younger generation want a different style. 1995 was quite difficult; the facilities have changed now – we have Powerpoint, teaching materials, video etc (not just research journals and lectures.) Yes, we have to make the lectures more attractive to the younger generation, otherwise they will fall asleep (laughing). It's a change in society, not one imposed by the university" (TR5).

Nevertheless, there was some negative feeling that styles of teaching had for some while been influenced by western methods, and that this trend was continuing:

> "You know, when I was in the UK, I took a course in academic pedagogy, run by the Higher Education Academy. Now Taiwan is copying this idea... there is so much copying of Western systems here, we often complain about it, but it seems inevitable... my HOD for the first time this year, he demanded detailed syllabi for my courses, just like the ones I had to produce in the UK..." (TR6).

Another issue which emerged was the rigidity of MoE employment regulations which imposed teaching on all academics. Some thought that there should be more flexibility, and in this respect celebrated ideas from overseas:

> "Actually, I like the system you have (UK) where there are teaching fellows and research fellows... it allows you to focus on one or the other..." (TR4).

These issues are referred to in general terms in the ATU Proposal (ATU: 46-48). Linked to the perceived problem of teaching loads and the pressure to publish, was the notion that teaching standards were in decline. A respondent referred to a student movement at IoT known as 'Bai Da Wei Xin', a reaction to the ATU project: this movement had recently published a 'black paper' which claimed that students were being neglected in the rush to achieve the ATU aims.

> "Students at IoT have started complaining about the quality of teaching... they have started an internet campaign... it's all to do with the demands being put on staff here... there is so much pressure..." (TR10).

There were indications that evaluation of teachers by students took place for each course, though the results of these evaluations were known only to the teacher and the HOD, and the results did not figure in staff evaluations. Interestingly, only half a page of the 100 page ATU document focused on the evaluation of teaching performance. A student respondent summed up the situation thus:

> "These evaluations are not taken all that seriously by students or staff... some students spoil their evaluation papers. Actually, they are taken much more seriously in the private universities, because they need to improve quality more..." (TR11).

8.4.6 Concluding comments

I commence the comments here by pointing out the primacy of IoT within the national HE context, and the significance of the central government planning: IoT had been identified as the national flagship institution. My respondents saw themselves in a context of local, regional and global competition; there was great awareness of global league tables, and a determination to achieve positional improvement. This was an institutional aim and was being organised through super-Deans at offices such as the ORD and the OIA. There appeared to be a shift in management styles towards more direction and steering of faculty members, through increased monitoring of research and teaching activities, and encouragement to be more involved internationally. Some

respondents offered critiques regarding imitation of 'the West', about internationalisation, and globalisation:

> "Without globalisation, you don't need the ranking. So this is the culprit. You need checks and balance to make globalisation work" (TR3).

This statement clearly suggests that globalisation has had an effect on universities in East Asia, which is the query at the heart of this study: in the previous four chapters, the developmental contexts of the four case study institutions have been explored and the data from the respondents analysed and presented. In the following chapter, the findings of the study are presented, that is, the data from each unique national context is examined and analysed to see if collectively the data supports the notion of globalisation, in the sense that it is affecting the governance of universities.

Part C: Outcomes, Comparisons, Conclusions

Chapter 9. Findings and Comparison

9.1 Introduction

It is important to remind ourselves at this point that this is an empirical chronicle which sets out to examine whether an increasingly powerful international and global dimension affects HE at the micro level. Has this global dimension penetrated institutions in three very different East Asian polities, in the same way that it influences an institution in a Western nation? The focus of the study shifts to reputation management; does this produce an internal or institutional governance activity which promotes similar changes or similar goals in these unique national contexts? In other words, are there indications of a convergence of the dimensions of governance, whether that be policy, project or practice, at a sufficiently fine-grained level, that this may provide evidence of a visible globalisation process? If reputation management is a project at the institutions under study, what are the effects on policy and practice? Do those who seek to build reputation within individual institutions also seek to influence the choices of academics and students in favour of those particular institutions, thus revealing an increasing marketisation of HE?

In the Introduction to this thesis, where some of the pertinent literature is reviewed, we have seen how Enders claims that our understanding of globalisation is still in its infancy (Enders 2004: 361); my intention in this chapter is to suggest that there is evidence to demonstrate that the globalisation of HE can be observed from the empirical data. From the literatures which comment upon the neo-liberal project, emerges the notion of the 'competition-state': "National competitiveness has increasingly become a central preoccupation of governance strategies across the world" (Watson and Hey 2003:299). And these literatures argue that the Knowledge Economy (KE) is key to the success of the 'competition state'; that universities are engines of knowledge make this argument more potent, as competition becomes an end in itself, and is condensed into indices.

This chapter hopes to support this argument, and to review the idea that as a result, "universities are encouraged to act in market-like ways" (Mok and Welch 2003); I view

the league table as a device of the market (Chapter 3). I also draw upon the idea in the literature of a 'rapidly changing, revolving door' governance, or continuous managerial re-invention, within HEIs (Marginson and Considine 2000), and will review whether 'the market' is a factor influencing the direction of governance change.

In the Research Methods chapter, I refer to Kerr's definition of convergence as "growing similarities", rather than identical sameness in the structures, processes and performance of societies (Kerr 1983). I also refer to Bennett's position that there are different dimensions to convergence, and in this study I intend to observe both the direction of change and the reason or motive behind the change or changes, within the context of HE. My intention then, is to ask what is converging over what period, and under what circumstances.

This Chapter is organised into eight sections which follow the data template described in Chapter 4, with which the reader will now be familiar; the section headings are the same as those which were used to organise the analysis of the previous four chapters. The intentions with regard to the first three sections differ from the latter five sections. What links all of these sections is the focus on league tables, and what follows from the power of these league tables is reputation management as a mechanism of governance change. I would argue that positioning on these devices (league tables) can only deliver reputation, because positioning says nothing about individuals or departments or faculties; indeed, it is hardly necessary to define reputation because what matters for many is the place on the rank. What I intend to demonstrate is that 'trying to do better in the ranks' is common to all of the case study institutions, though it is locally contingent; I also intend to demonstrate that both the direction of change and the motive behind the change are common. This is what gives the comparison legitimacy. League tables, I suggest, are a real index of globalisation because they impose reputation management as a key element in the management of HE institutions. Thus league tables are the most precise expression of the globalisation of the agenda of HE.

In the first of the eight sections of this chapter I analyse the respondents' view of the nation state as a site of competition with other states.

9.2 Research Findings: the Faculty within the Wider Environment

9.2.1 A Context of Competition

In this section, the intention is to compare how the respondents in different institutions reflect upon the notion of the 'competition state', and how the 'state' was perceived as a source of pressure upon the institution (see, for example, Jessop 2003, Watson and Hey 2003). Many of my respondents felt the pressure of competition very keenly, and made frequent references to it; in each location, mention was made of the perception that other institutions, local or international, had attracted the 'best' students or staff. Most respondents in the UK, Taiwan and Hong Kong felt that the competitive environment had developed gradually, that it had somehow deepened, and it was something they could not avoid. They also expressed the imperative to engage in this competition. However, it appeared that the awareness of competition in the PRC was of a lower order than in the other case study institutions.

Regarding the arrival of this perceived 'sexed-up' competition, UKR1 observed that he felt his institution was at a turning point, "at a cross roads" (in 2009), as a result of the new environment, and he identified the international league tables as a key factor. Others at IoUK discussed the layers of rankings which had built up over the previous decades, which had promoted this environment. Respondents at IoHK saw this aspect in much the same way, with increasing competition arriving with each new 'layer' of league table. In Taiwan, my respondents certainly identified the early years of the new millennium as the era of this enhanced competition, but none could or would identify the factor or agent responsible for it; it was as if they were one (or two) hierarchical layers removed from the decision making, and had not therefore asked about the driving force. In the PRC, I found a more relaxed approach to competition; there were no comments about a recent intensification, though the efforts to drive up standards were always present.

Where did the case study institutions perceive that competition came from? For IoC, there was a considerable infrastructure to support a small number of international students and staff in this very large university; I met faculty staff from Germany and France who were contributing to teaching programmes where there were gaps in Chinese expertise, and students from every continent. Nevertheless, all the data pointed

towards an emphasis on the domestic market. IoC appeared to be competing primarily for the best domestic students and for government funds on the basis of its performance and reputation. There are two points to make here: firstly, the HE system in PRC is of such a scale, and is so highly centralised, that it is hardly surprising that staff feel a little remote from the cutting edge of competition; secondly, the regional (provincial) government's involvement in the funding of IoC suggests that there exists a strong regional competition for prestige within the boundaries of PRC.

In contrast, IoHK and IoT saw competition all around them, "... not just from local universities but from regionally, and globally" (HK2). IoHK operated in an environment where some of the children of the local elite looked to Europe and the US for their HE opportunities (HKR2). And for both institutions, the China factor loomed large; the respondents spoke about their fears of marginalisation in the context of their huge neighbour. Hence, there is a need to develop their distinctiveness; for example, there was mention in Hong Kong of its label as a 'melting pot', and in Taiwan of its custody of Chinese culture, and both institutions appeared to be keen to exploit their geographical, positional advantages as regional hubs. The faculties I studied had deep links with HE in the PRC; IoT was ready to strengthen these further when the political landscape allowed. Of course, both had very many other links, other than with China.

Respondents at IoUK made much more general comments about where the competition came from, in comparison with IoT and IoHK. IoUK respondents rarely mentioned particular countries or nations as competitors; what was noticeable was that Europe was not referred to. One respondent mentioned the US in the context of publishing in particular journals, with the implication that it was the US which was the standard bearer of quality and prestige. Two respondents referred to other 'rival' institutions within the UK; perhaps this sense of inter-institutional competition in the UK reflects the fact that UK institutions have enjoyed an erstwhile independence in the sense that they have the authority to award degrees, rather than being a part of the state apparatus, though that autonomy has been much whittled away. And as with IoHK, respondents differentiated the student body into the components of undergraduate and postgraduate in order to point out the different competitive characteristics of these segments. Only at IoUK was pricing (for student fees) mentioned, in the sense that competitors' fees were a factor in deciding its own.

In what manner did respondents appear to approach the competitive environment? The data from IoC was different in character from the other institutions. Competition was clearly important, but the respondents seemed less personally engaged in the struggle. There was mention of seeking, for example, a global reputation, but much of this talk appeared to be rhetorical. I was told that life as a PRC academic was much less stressful than as a Western or a Hong Kong counterpart, and that the academic in the People's Republic enjoyed a certain status in society which had its roots in thousands of years of respect for higher learning. I also detected a pragmatic acceptance that IoC was in the 'catch-up' stage of its development, that it was doing well in this process, but there was still some way to go. These factors summarised for me a marked attitudinal singularity at IoC, when compared to the other case study institutions; in IoHK, IoT and IoUK there appeared to be a much greater level of engagement with the processes of competition, or even anxiety regarding that process.

At IoHK, I sensed a personal commitment to the changes that respondents perceived. Some spoke in such terms such as 'the need to drive change' (HKR2). At IoT, a Dean expressed her "deep concern in terms of development of this university", and her determination to promote the university. And in both these institutions, respondents seemed to identify with the national struggle; comments such as "this is very important for Taiwan" (TR2) and "we have to drive this agenda forward... it's vital for Hong Kong" (HKR3) were typical of the apparent levels of personal engagement. At IoUK, the Dean and the Dean-elect spoke with conviction about the need to change the culture and attitudes of those who were not up to speed with the new competitive landscape, though they did not explicitly identify with a national project or the national good.

Summing up, then, much of the data in this study is consonant with the literature which sees competition between nation states as a fact of 'neo-liberal life'. This is the case particularly in the smaller nation institutions in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and magnified by the presence of a fast-developing China. In China itself, competition seemed to be less keenly felt. In the UK, competition seemed to be particularly multi-layered, and problematised by a resource base which appeared barely adequate to support the quality to which all aspired. In the next section, the focus turns away from national competition and towards how that competition is, in some quarters, judged, with an examination of the respondents' views on global league tables.

9.2.2 A Context of League Tables

The literature regarding global league tables reviewed in Chapter 3 examines the origin of these devices, and offers some critiques of their construction and of their usefulness. The intention here is certainly different, and perhaps less sophisticated. I intend to compare my respondents' awareness of these tables, to judge whether the tables were regarded as important, and if so, in what ways.

To what degree were my respondents aware of the global league tables? The respondents at IoHK, IoT and IoUK revealed a considerable depth of knowledge about the ranking systems which were explored in Chapter 3 of this study, or perhaps more correctly, they revealed an awareness of the institution in which they operated. By this I mean that if the respondent her/himself had not studied the ranking systems, then it appeared that her/his contact with others in the institution, either formally or informally, had led them to awareness. If I could demonstrate this last point with reference to IoT: all the respondents at IoT were familiar with the ATU (Aiming for Top University) document; many had no doubt discussed it at formal meetings, though I did not ask whether respondents had contributed to the document. Familiarity with the ATU document, freely available on the Institution's website, both in Mandarin and in English, would provide a reader with a wealth of knowledge of the mechanisms of the various ranking systems. Thus the discourse of the league table was, at IoT, an 'official' institutional discourse.

The situation at IoUK was more nuanced. As one respondent explained, the official view of the Vice Chancellor at IoUK was that the Institution should view the ranking systems at arm's length and that "it's a better strategy to say what your own strengths are" (UKR2); one might suggest that the 'party line' at IOUK was anti-league table. This official view appears to mask the reality of deep interest and even anxiety regarding the pronouncements of league tables. The Communications Director at IoUK told me that the VC was the first to e-mail him the news of the latest THES global positional ranking of IoUK in September 2009. Further, my respondents appeared to have a deep understanding of the mechanisms of the ranking systems. The Dean, for example, expressed his view that the SHJT rank was a particularly powerful indicator in the eyes of many academics; he included himself in this category.

At IoHK, the position appeared to be somewhere between that of IoUK and IoT. The Dean spoke of the Council chairman's view that the rank which had been 'achieved' in the THES table in 2008 was something which should be celebrated, a 'platform' for the future. The respondents at IoHK also appeared to have a thorough understanding of the mechanisms of the ranking systems, though the Vice-Dean expressed his view that the THES rank had the capacity for better judgement of an institution's standing. There was an air of pragmatism at IoHK which was more accepting of the power of these ranks and what was needed to take advantage of them.

IoC was the only institution where I had to repeat the initial question regarding global league tables to a respondent (the Dean); whether this was a matter of misunderstanding or poor diction on my part, I do not know, but there were no other communication difficulties during the interview. But it was illustrative of his responses regarding global league tables in general; these devices, which elsewhere were clearly on people's minds, were not at the forefront of his attention, nor of the other respondents at IoC. The Dean's response to my initial question regarding global league tables is worth repeating here: "I don't take much notice of this" (CR8). In the context of the PRC, it appeared the league table mechanism did not trigger a marked response; a variety of reasons are suggested in this chapter.

It is interesting to compare the reaction to league tables of the two institutions which represent the two centralised HE systems which form part of this study, namely IoC and IoT. As we have seen in Taiwan, ATU is an MoE project, indeed a national project; the MoE has fashioned the discourse of the league table as an 'official' institutional discourse for IoT. In the People's Republic, officials are more cautious of celebrating the power of the league table, considering these devices as too complicated for the general public to understand (CR8). Thus far the MoE (PRC) has not published whatever evaluations it has gathered. There is an interesting disconnect between the official caution of the Ministry and the PRC public, who are apparently enthusiastic about such devices of the market place as 'brand' and 'rank'.

Were league tables judged to be important, and if so, in what ways? Clearly most of the respondents at IoT followed the institutional line, and associated success in the positional game as synonymous with institutional, even national, success. The importance of the positional rank drove an entire strategy to advance the visibility of

both the institution and the nation, which will be demonstrated in the following sections. Fear of regional marginalisation appeared to be an important factor in the development of the strategy. But there was no mention of domestic competition, nor of domestic league tables, from any of the respondents. We might call IoT a 'primate' institution, in the sense that it is, and has long been, the 'top' Taiwanese university by some margin and has no internal competitors.

The fear of regional marginalisation was also reported at IoHK, but there was a different domestic environment. Hong Kong has a number of strong universities which do compete for students with IoHK; hence the comment that students use league tables to choose institutions (HKR2). Thus the pressure to perform came from both the domestic, and as with IoT, the regional and global contexts (HKR2). At IoUK, the idea that domestic and global positioning were linked was mentioned twice; and only at IoUK did respondents report that global positioning was linked to income streams. And only at IoC was the significance of international league tables downplayed; there was also an admission that the ranking of domestic institutions was so stable that there was little prospect of "breaking into the top five" (CR8), such was the inertia provided by current resource deployment.

To sum up, we can say that despite the differences of context discussed above, respondents at IoHK, IoT and IoUK were very aware of the major global league tables and the mechanisms which produced the rankings. For many of the respondents, the issue of league tables "had moved up the agenda" (UKR2). The major drivers of interest in the rankings appeared to be a cocktail of factors, which included a fear of losing out to competitor regions and competitor institutions in the contest for the best students, the best staff and the best reputations, and a perceived need to achieve 'visibility' for their own institutions. However, at IoC, the aura of competition appeared to be of a different order; that aura did not appear to be of the same magnitude. Despite the rhetoric of seeking an international status, and involvement in a wide variety of international collaborations, the data I collected pointed towards the greater significance of competition at the domestic level rather than the international; perhaps this competition was conducted through the medium of international reputation. I came to the view that for the international scene at IoC, collaboration was more important than competition.

In the next section I will examine how the issues discussed above might impact on organisational change in the case study institutions.

9.2.3 A Context of Organisational Change

The literature regarding organisational change in HE, reviewed in Chapter 2, examines the pace and direction of change, and posits that there may be convergence of various organisational features, though these literatures focus on the Anglo-Saxon part of the HE spectrum. The intention here is to make an assessment of the organisational changes which were reported to me and to assess whether such changes bore any relationship to the environments of competition and league tables discussed in the two previous sections. One has to bear in mind that any organisational changes could be influenced by many other factors, some of which have been mentioned earlier in this piece, such as the quest for economies and efficiencies, and the change of scale of each of the case study institutions as massification has taken place. It should also be borne in mind that since organisational change is not the central focus of this thesis, I will only be inferring the motives of policy makers from the statements made by my respondents and from the literatures read; it was not the intention to attempt to make contact with such personnel.

I begin this analysis with what appears to be a converging significance of, and enhanced status of, the social sciences in the nations under study, an important context to bear in mind as the analysis proceeds. I would argue that at IoUK and IoHK, the social sciences have achieved a certain level of acceptance and respect for some considerable time, which reflects the societies in which they operate. At IoC and IoT, recent central policy has re-evaluated the contribution which these disciplines make to society, and the previous focus on 'hard' sciences has shifted a little; during this century, greater resources have been found to promote these areas of study (Zhou 2006, Li 2005). At all the Chinese case study institutions, new buildings were under construction which would see the faculty geographically concentrated in each location.

An interesting area of convergence in governance practice is the change in lines of responsibility in each of the case study institutions. At IoC and IoT, there is a tradition of the appointed Dean; at IoHK, the change from Dean elect to appointee took place in 2006; at IoUK, this change occurred in 2001. Heads of Departments at IoC, IoHK, and

IoT are also appointed, but again this is a recent change for IoHK. Further, a member of the SMT at IoC and IoUK has been given oversight responsibility for the Faculty of Social Sciences at their respective institutions. At IoUK, the Dean used the term 'super-Dean' to describe this role. Perhaps this title could describe the Dean's position at IoHK, where the control of budgets has moved from departments to the faculty, and where the situation was described by HKR2 as a "re-centralisation" at the level of the faculty; no SMT team member at IoHK has specific responsibility for named faculty affairs. I was not able to ascertain whether such oversight occurs at IoT, though the interaction at IoT between *all* Colleges and the OIA/ORD, described in Chapter 8, might render further SMT involvement superfluous.

What motives might lie behind this apparent convergence towards a more centralised style of governance? Clearly this is a complex area worthy of much deeper study than can be achieved here, but I nevertheless venture a few points. Stronger lineal authority may be necessary in an environment where it is more important that people are seen to be singing from the same hymn sheet; senior managers at IoHK and IoUK, where there appeared to the greatest shift, clearly feel the greater significance of strategy over day-to-day operations in their present circumstances. Respondents in these latter two institutions claimed that the centre seized opportunities to centralise authority, such as when IoHK planned to move to a four year undergraduate programme, and when IoUK found itself in a financial crisis.

There were different imperatives for centralisation at each case study institution. In Taiwan, a re-centralisation seemed to have taken shape as the MoE partnered IoT in the ATU project; at IoC, an established centralisation suits the purposes of local managers and the MoE as they strive for improvements in quality. The drift "of power in favour of the centre" (UKR5) appears to suit the managers at IoUK and IoHK as they strive respectively for tighter budgetary control and the imposition of greater consistency in operations and systems, and to drive forward particular agendas relating to research and internationalisation. Indeed, many respondents made reference to 'driving change', 'driving agendas', and 'new imperatives'. Though I outline above motives of specific institutions, in general these agendas were sounding more and more similar; a top-down approach seemed to favour the perceived need to improve 'quality', to steer system changes, to tighten regulation, to address an expanding internationalisation, to manage research. I would argue that these agendas are made all the more urgent with the arrival

of what I have described as the current 'international dimension', and a heightened awareness of the global.

Supporting the above claim is the mention at all of the case study institutions of the perception of some sort of cultural change, or the need for some sort of 'cultural change', and it seems that these changes are all pointing towards a more similar model. At IoC, respondents perceived the need for a shift away from the 'rule of man' towards the 'rule of law', and for quality regimes to be more akin to a western model. At IoUK, the Dean spoke of the need for a culture change which would allow the Institution to act more effectively as an international organisation, accepting, for example, that staff could be of the university, but not at the university; at IoT, the Dean spoke of a change of style, referring to an increased managerialism, and a change to centrally directed research. The Dean at IoHK also spoke about the tensions which had arisen as a greater proportion of research was planned from above, disrupting the existing culture. The model to which these different perceptions point is one which is closely managed and regulated, with administrative units of a particular size, driven by strategic objectives, and international by decree.

Also percolating through the data is reference to system changes, as well as organisational change. These system changes will be referred to in later sections, but collectively they seem to point in the same direction: the search for quality, for validity, for efficiency. Why does the Dean need to work towards research which has greater impact, towards PhD programmes which will better support students, towards teaching programmes which produce satisfied students? There are clearly a range of answers, including that the Dean should want such features in his or her faculty, but again the arrival of a heightened need for a sound reputation, prompted by the arrival of a phalanx of league tables, must be within that range.

I finish this section referring to Marginson and Considine's notion of "rapidly changing revolving door governance, or continuous managerial re-invention", which seems pertinent in a discussion of organisational change. Their conclusion about the entrepreneurial university in times of extreme competition is that a chaos of responses is the result:

> "Schools replace departments, and are re-arranged again, disciplines change titles, super-faculties rise and fall, informal assemblies rise and disappear, DVC and PVC offices seem to be equipped with a revolving door" (Marginson and Considine 2000:235).

They suggest that authority fosters instability in order to stay one step ahead in a game which is poorly understood. In the opening remark of this piece, Marginson uses the word "destabilised" in the context of the university and its traditions. Perhaps their view reflects accurately the situation in Australia of a decade ago, when an entrepreneurial ethos did not provide a sufficiently strong set of guidelines, but I suggest that global league tables have in fact given an added certainty to the direction in which managers need to travel, since there is now a rule book, or a set of rule books; never mind that those rule books emerged from academics who did not know they were writing rule books, or from politically-motivated publishers who were providing easily digestible information to consumers, the fact is that there are now common templates for all to follow. My view is that for as long as these templates are accepted, however reluctantly, there will inevitably follow a change towards a strategically driven organisational framework, glimpses of which we have seen in the data provided by the case studies here, which promotes a blend of traditional academic values with an acceptance of "newer managerial points of view", as proposed by Clarke in his work on organisational transformations in HE (Clarke 1998). Far from "continuous managerial re-invention", I detect in the case study data common objectives which are shaping consistent organisational patterns, and I suggest these patterns are emerging as a result of globalisation.

The three sections above have engaged with the data relating to contexts emerging from the literatures. There now follow five sections which will attempt to compare the data relating specifically to roles and processes at the case study institutions, commencing with role of the Dean. What I hope to demonstrate in the following sections is the response of the individual institution to the contexts outlined above, and to see how far those responses are shaped by the environments above; these convergences in governance are the focus of the study.

9.3 Research findings: Practice within the Faculty

9.3.1 The Role of the Dean

I start here by reiterating my reasons for approaching this study from the viewpoint of the Dean. Crucially, I interpret the role of the Dean as straddling the strategic and the operational within the university; as a result, he/she may be able to provide a researcher with a view of the pressures which shape strategy, because the Dean is necessarily involved with senior managers, and he/she may also be able to provide a view of governance and how governance may be re-fashioned as a response to the aforementioned pressures. This section seeks to elicit how the Dean is appointed, how the role of the Dean might vary from institution to institution, and how that role might be changing, within the contexts of the individual nation states which form the backdrop to the study.

As a forword to the detail below, I first argue that the perspectives from the Deans who kindly gave of their time were of great benefit to this project. In general, each Dean was able to provide an 'overview', or flavour, of their institution, from their position as somewhere in the middle of the institutional hierarchy. By 'overview', I mean that my respondents gave me an insight into the thinking of those with more senior responsibilities, and of those who were directly managed by them, as well as the contexts in which the institutions were located. This overview emerged not from a particular, explicit question or series of questions, but from explanatory comments made to me throughout the interviews. Another general point to make is that the respondents' perspective was from that of the management of the institution, and appeared to be sympathetic with the discourses of competition and change.

All respondents made comments about the strategic directions in which their institutions were being steered, but equally about the reactions of departments, and of individual lecturers/researchers for whom they had some responsibilities. For example, in her explanations for the activities at IoT, a Dean was enthusiastic in her discussions about national economic priorities, and the place of the institution in that context; another Dean at the same institution was able to provide details regarding the struggles which teachers experienced with the increased report-writing; at IoHK, the Dean and his Assistant Dean were able to comment on the attitudes and aspirations of senior

managers and the HK Legislature, and to discuss the impact on researchers as they (the researchers) were confronted with expectations to operate in more collaborative ways.

With regard to the appointment of the Deans, it is interesting to discover that the appointment systems appears to be similar, and that there has been some convergence towards this point during these few years of this century. The movement towards this commonality has been on the part of the IoUK and IoHK, where the traditional (within their 'Western' systems) elections of Deans from and by faculty staff, has given way to an 'appointment' procedure by senior managers. There has been no movement, as far I could detect, from the appointment system of IoT and IoC, where for the last 50 years, both have operated an appointment system in line with policy from their respective MoEs; China and Taiwan's HE systems remain national and centralised. IoUK and IoHK are regarded as institutions with autonomy over their administrative and organisational systems and yet they have both moved towards a more centralised 'modus operandum' in this regard. In the section above relating to organisation changes, the possible motives for this movement, towards strategically driven frameworks in what are now much larger institutions, have been rehearsed.

It was further interesting to discover how similar the process of selection for the Dean at both IoC and IoUK was. To compare these two institutions in this regard might at first seem rather surprising, given their very different roots; the former is an institution representative of a centralised system which is itself part of a Communist state, and the latter is representative of traditional Western autonomy in a liberal democracy. At IoC, the process was described as something between election and appointment, consistent with the principle of "democratic centralism"(CR3), where colleagues were encouraged to make comments regarding the proposed appointee before the final decision was made by a senior management team. At IoUK, the process was reported as a similar interaction between managers and faculty staff. At IoT, I was not able to discuss the appointment in such detail, though I did gather that the appointment to Dean usually involved a current member of staff, as was the case with the Dean (Social Science) whom I interviewed.

Only at IoHK did I come across the appointment of the Dean of Social Sciences from outside the faculty. It appears that this coincided with a change in organisation and in culture, as discussed in the section above. The appointee came from a different

institution in Hong Kong which, I was told, had quite a different approach from IoHK in that it had a history (of a couple of decades) of being rather entrepreneurial, whereas IoHK did not (HKR2). It would be interesting to research the frequency of external appointees in the nations under study, and to see what factors might motivate such appointments. Certainly at IoHK, the motive for the current Dean's appointment appeared to be linked with the "re-centralisation at the level of the faculty" (HKR2), and the rather different role for the Dean which had been envisioned by senior managers when he was appointed in 2006; the Dean at IoHK was also something of an 'outlier', standing apart from the other case study institutions, when one examines that role, more of which below.

When comparing the responses to my question put to the Deans about their roles as managers of areas within Social Science, it was clear that there were a number of features which were common. These common areas included:

- that a Dean should set the tone for the faculty
- that a Deans should represent the university, which required of them a certain academic reputation, preferably international
- that there was a great deal of administrative work, which appeared to take up more than half of the Dean's time
- that there was a duty for the Dean to represent *to* the faculty or college, the views of the Vice Chancellor or President and his senior team
- that the Dean was to establish good relationships with faculty staff
- that the Dean was involved with appraisals of faculty staff
- that the Dean was involved in the financial organisation of the faculty
- that the Dean was involved in promoting 'cultural' shifts

With regard to the above duties, it might be argued that some differ little from a decade ago, but nevertheless some are worth examination in greater detail, particularly if they relate to reputation management. I commence with a review of the duties of the Dean

which appear to have remained constant before moving onto areas where there is divergence of practice.

With regard to administrative duties, the Dean at IoT seemed particularly busy interpreting and reacting to, the demands of others, encouraging his staff to inform the two Offices (the ORD and the OIA) of their progress; he seemed to have particular bureaucratic burdens resulting from the hands on approach of the MoE and the governance arrangements at IoT. He appeared to be most active in representing the views of senior managers to his staff. As a result, the Dean suggested that he was personally involved with very little strategic direction; he was, of course, acutely busy with his own research duties.

Inter-faculty relationship building was listed as a duty at IoC, IoUK and IoHK. Only at IoC did the Dean explicitly say that he needed to retain the trust of the central authorities at the university; from what CR3 suggested, the mix of CCP officialdom and the traditional cultural importance of community relations may have made this more significant for this Dean than others. He also explicitly stated that he was keen to raise the income situation for his colleagues. The Dean at IoUK posited that it was very important for someone in his position to be a problem-solver rather than a problem-maker in terms of personal relations. The Dean at IoHK was looking forward to moving into the new community of buildings which are currently being completed, so that he might see faculty staff regularly; he felt here would be a dividend to be gained through this informal contact. Again, such sensitivities probably represent a continuity of practice rather than a change.

All respondents noted that dealing with staff appraisals was amongst the duties of the Dean, and at each of the case study institutions other than IoC, there was the acceptance that some contracts were not renewed in the search for quality. Only at IoC did the Dean exclaim that he wished he "could fire someone", an expression of his frustration with PRC labour laws. And only at IoUK was this desire to promote quality manifest in the explicit encouragement of specific 'problem' departments to better perform; indeed, in the context of a difficult financial situation, the Dean at IoUK was involved in decisions regarding the closure of those 'problem' departments (see below). I suggest that in this aspect of the Dean's role, that is, with regard to staff appraisal and the

encouragement of under-performing elements to do better, we can see where his or her duties as manager of reputation have evolved.

When Deans reported on their duties involving financial arrangements within the faculty, their reports illuminated contextual difference. At IoHK, the Dean explicitly stated that he had no problems regarding resources. He had plenty of funding for research, and could find donors to support projects such as scholarships or one-off conferences; wages for Hong Kong academics were good, and a new campus was under construction. At IoC, the Dean did not mention that resources were an issue, though he did say that he was active in fundraising; there was support from the provincial government and new buildings, indeed new campuses, were in evidence. A key respondent reported that PRC academics enjoyed the time and freedom to work and earn outside the institution. At IoT, salary levels remained an issue, but there were resources available from the OIA and ORD for conferences, training, visiting scholars, research projects and the like; new buildings were also under construction. Resources did appear to be more of an issue at IoUK; it is the only location where there was an openly acknowledged funding crisis, and there was evidence that the Dean was personally involved in the unpleasant duties of balancing expenditures and incomes, as reported in the UK case study chapter.

We can see from above that there are clear areas of difference in the detailed duties of the Deans, which one might expect from their very different contexts, but one interesting area of convergence is that of their role in what we might call 'changing cultures'. I find this a particularly interesting similarity, as it illuminates a commonality in direction; all the respondents noted that included in their duties was the need to shift expectations. For the Dean at IoC, the cultural shift he identified was with regard to promotion on the basis of talent rather than seniority; as discussed in the PRC case study chapter, there were other issues regarding *guanxi* and the delicacies of handling relationships, which are likely to have exercised his mind. Respondents at IoT and IoHK identified research as an area where "a change of style" (TR8) was considered necessary, a change towards a greater element of teamwork. And at IoUK, the Dean and Dean-elect made reference to the need to shift attitudes of those staff who could not see the new environment of competition, and who did not understand the need to be a thoroughly international organisation. Collectively, I see these shifts as linked by virtue of their adherence to a common model: a Western model, a competitive model, an

internally-collaborative model, a model where the management of reputation has become significant.

I posit that we can also see this uni-directional process if we return to the Dean's duties at IoHK. One could argue that the job description as Dean of Social Sciences at IoHK is an 'outlier' in comparison to those at the other case study institutions; one could use it as an example of divergence. If we look more closely at what he has achieved at IoHK, we see a specifically strategic role not reported at the other case study institutions. The Hong Kong Dean referred to two retreats which he engaged in at the beginning of his Deanship. At these retreats, he considered the strategic direction of the faculty over a five year time-span; he arrived at a particular 'branding' of the faculty, as described in Chapter 7. We have to remember that the strategic direction of the faculty was gifted to him by senior managers; I am under the impression that before this arrangement, there was no faculty-wide strategic direction, not that this appeared to have diminished the success of the faculty. A result of this deliberation by the Dean was the research project 'Global Cities' which aimed to harness the talents of the whole faculty and to link with 'strategic partners'.

Now, the detail above illustrates that 'Dean-ing' in one institution is not the same as 'Dean-ing' in a different institution. The entire discussion above also illustrates this. 'Dean-ing' is locally contingent, bounded by the contexts of the institution and its national setting. Indeed, this study is not claiming that 'Dean-ing' is a convergent experience, though some of that experience may be so. But what the study does suggest is that by looking at the experience of the Dean, we can see a number of converging processes at different universities in different national settings. The Dean's work at IoHK underlines a number of processes: a deliberation of strategy, disseminating that strategy in the public/faculty domain, and creating projects to flesh out the strategy. At IoT, for example, these tasks are carried out by personnel other than the Dean, in the Offices of Research and Development and International Affairs, but they are clearly carried out, as they are at the other case study institutions; and clearly a motive behind these processes is the management of reputation. In this regard we can see Vaira's notion of 'organisational allomorphism' (Vaira 2004: 483), in the sense that these tasks are deemed necessary at each case institution, though how the tasks are achieved or delivered is locally determined.

These questions remain: how do the strategies emerging from the institutions translate into practice, and do those practices represent a convergence? In the remaining four sections of this chapter, the focus turns to those operational practices and processes reported by Deans and their faculty staff.

9.3.2 Reputation Building Strategies

At all of the case study institutions, the reputation of the institution was considered of immediate importance. In this section, I look at what the respondents viewed as the purpose of building reputation in their institution, what kind of strategies they employed to do so, and some of the problems which emerged and which located the institution in its context.

I found that IoT and IoUK shared a common purpose regarding reputation, explicitly stated in writing, that is, to enhance that reputation globally. In the case of IoT, this statement was contained within the ATU document, and also explicitly linked reputation to league table positioning; at IoUK, the statement appeared on the website as its first priority amongst its strategic goals, but did not explicitly link this with league table positioning. Running alongside these statements was the data collected from respondents, which always supported these textual proclamations. At IoHK and IoC, I personally found no textual references to reputation building, though that does not mean that such statements do not exist; but I was told by the respondents at both institutions that this was an important element in their strategic directions.

Looking at the purposes for reputation building in more detail, we have already seen that for IoT, the intended transformation of the institution is a national project (Chapter 8) linked to the vision of the nation as a services hub for the region; high ranking national universities are integral to that vision. For all the case studies, there is a similar context of national economic development as an element of the 'competition state' (Chapter 2). They converge upon the development of a knowledge economy, which is in turn dependent on the strength and well-being of the university sector; but of the case study institutions, only IoT is the 'chosen' national 'flagship' project. Whether the other polities in the study also had 'flagship' institutions is a question which goes beyond the remit of this study.

The purposes for reputation building are varied, and can be interpreted as both a 'means' and an 'end': as a means for greater resources in some cases, and as an end towards, for example, higher rank positioning. Nevertheless, reputation building appears to be centred on certain circularities. Certainly my respondents were often talking about the same thing, that is, league tables, with the exception of IoC (Chapter 6). At IoHK, the Dean stated that he wished to "align (the faculty) with great universities globally", and although he did not use the words 'world class'(see, for example, Deem, Mok, and Lucas 2008), I think that we can infer from the institutions he has had talks with, that he wishes the faculty to be seen as 'world class'. His associate Dean expressed the idea that it was "easy to slip down" if one was not active; did this image of 'slipping down' have anything to do with league tables? At IoC, respondents reported the purpose of a good reputation as enabling the institution to attract high quality staff and students and funding; at IoT, attracting high quality staff was reported as one of the strategies to enhance reputation. The point here is that these two, that is, reputation and high quality staff, are perceived as inextricably linked, and probably mutually reinforcing. Only at IoUK was it reported that one of the purposes of maintaining a good reputation was to ensure income streams from overseas students, whether they were supported by their governments or themselves; reputation management at IoUK is clearly a 'means' as well as an 'end'. All the institutions agreed that reputation was important for assuring research funding.

Strategies for building reputation also varied, but followed similar themes. The respondents reported that these strategies centred on the topics of research, international exposure, and teaching; each of these will be the focus of a later section in this chapter. For example, at IoC, more than 200 overseas scholars had been attracted to the university with a pannier of incentives, ranging from bonuses to housing benefits and research funds; at IoT, research grants were also made available to scholars who were willing to move to Taiwan; at IoUK and IoHK, salaries have been negotiable for some time. Generally, there was interest in how teachers were perceived by students, although this seemed less of a priority in Taiwan. Strategies which we might associate with marketing were reported at IoUK and IoHK; in Hong Kong, the Dean spoke about "making a splash" in the local media and involving the CEO (Hong Kong's political leader) in the celebration of a faculty project; at IoUK, I was told of plans to hire a marketing officer to promote the faculty internationally.

At each institution, there were reports of new physical structures or buildings, and these were seen as enhancing reputation, though I suggest that the new buildings were seen as important though secondary to the quest for enhancing reputation. In all the Chinese campuses under study, the social sciences were moving physically closer together in a cluster of new blocks; this was seen as extremely useful in the context of a research future which seemed to be increasingly interdisciplinary. Of course, we have to remember that growing numbers of total students, and the consequent campus re-organisation, may well have been behind some of these developments. At IoUK, the new building work (rather than new buildings) seemed to be specifically a response to the inadequacy of existing spaces and negative student feedback.

The problems regarding reputation building, either reported or inferred, were interesting in that they demonstrated the contextual complexities at each institution. At IoC, there was the difficulty over the 'rule of man' (see Chapter 7) and how relationship sensitivities sometimes compromised quality. I was told that the working environment in a Chinese university was unique in that there were still covert practices and 'hidden regulations', which, for example, allowed some academics to be promoted above others on the grounds of relationships or seniority rather than ability, and that the environment was made more complex by the presence of the CCP within the organisational structures. My key informant stated that regulations were "fluid, and open to interpretation"; he suggested that in Hong Kong, where he also worked, regulation was rigidly adhered to. Informal discussion has lead me to believe that in Taiwan, this 'fluidity' did not exist, and that though the highly bureaucratic systems worked slowly in the MoE and at universities in general, regulation was indeed regulation.

Dwelling further on IoC, this institution did appear to be less motivated by the imperative of the league table and positional ranking; this emerges as a theme. I suggest a number of structural reasons. One is the role of the President. Unlike at the other institutions, the President of IoC is not an academic, but a Party official/manager; his next position is likely to be that of Provincial Governor/Assistant Governor. I suggest that though the career prospects are likely to drive him, there may not be quite the same level of drive or urgency which we might find at the other case study institutions. Then there is the centralised nature of the HE system in PRC; the influence of Beijing was very evident in my interview data, for example, in the requirement for all plans to be approved from the MoE. There is the question about the purposes of the

Chinese university system: is it just about education? Perhaps these features go some way to explain the relaxed nature of the academics I met, and the fact that CR4 described life for the PRC academic as much easier, with far more freedoms, than for the academic in HKSAR. Perhaps the media in PRC has less capacity to stir interest in the league table.

In complete contrast to the situation at IoC, regulation was also cited as a problem at IoT, because it was too rigid! I heard general complaints in Taiwan that the professionals at universities were managed by slow-moving Ministry bureaucrats, for whom the rule book was all. This universal frustration affected flexibility, they claimed; there were complaints, for example, regarding the requirement for all to teach. It was also claimed that at IoT, traditionally modest wages and lack of accommodation for sought-after scholars appeared to be impediments to the ATU plans; as detailed in Chapter 8, the ATU document itself commented that Ministry "restrictions and regulations pertaining to operating budgets for (academics)" were serious impediments to attracting the calibre of staff to which the project was aspiring. I found this particularly interesting in the context of the generous resources which seemed to be available to the project.

Resources were also a problem at IoUK; the over-reliance on government funding, grudgingly provided, appeared to have been a constant backdrop to the institution's affairs for more than half a century. In Chapter 5, attention was drawn to the closer steering of the sector by the government as the twentieth century progressed, and to tight control or reduction in grants to the sector during that period. In the twenty-first century, respondents at IoUK reported a few years of less stringent economic control, but at the time of writing, the financial problems have returned. There is now a fiscal environment (2009-2010) which demands cuts in all budgetary areas, including academic staff. There are huge efforts at the institution to seek alternative funding streams, such as donations and endowments, but the tradition of such civic generosity has been difficult to re-build. Further, the flexibilities afforded to SMT, in contrast to Taiwan, appear to have its own setbacks; some respondents hinted that the spending spree of a decade in the chase to manage reputation has resulted in the present financial difficulties.

IoHK seemed to have none of these particular problems; its staff appear to be well paid, there is both strong financial support from the government and a society which is keen to be philanthropic, and there is a strong tradition of academic performance rather than seniority. Perhaps these factors go some way to explain why that university is currently doing best in the race for global reputation. Perhaps one could argue that IoHK benefits from the best of East and West whilst being unencumbered by few of the negative features of these diverging HE cultures. Only at IoHK did the Dean make such bold statements about having "no problems with resources", claiming that for certain activities, he had only to advise his sponsors of the costs involved for these to be met in full (HKR1).

In conclusion then, there are a number of clear similarities in the attitudes to and strategies regarding reputation building at the institutions under study. I argue that here is sufficient evidence to suggest that league tables are one of the factors which are providing new motives to protect or manage reputation; the league table is the medium of reputation and provides the means to achieve reputation. All were seeking to enhance their reputations, and naturally enough, their strategies revolved around the core activities of research and teaching, attracting high quality staff, and ensuring an international environment; all of these involve the built environment. In the next section, the research cultures and activities of the case study institutions are examined.

9.3.3 The Research Culture

In this section, I look at how the respondents viewed research in their institution and what kind of routes they followed to foster research. I also attempt to identify the motives behind some of these processes. It may not be surprising that at all of the case study institutions, research was considered so important that this activity was central to the institutions' strategic direction; what might be surprising are the similarities which emerged in the way research is managed and how it is being shaped. Whether these similarities constitute a convergence of practice is the question behind what follows. Before the analysis, I will make three points: firstly, we have to view research as an institutional activity as well as a faculty and departmental activity; secondly, there is a 'history' of research management. The RAE in the UK and HKSAR, for example, is a device which has focused research monies towards institutions such as IoHK and IoUK, and which has shepherded research into criterion such as 'research impact' (Lucas

op.cit: 51); thirdly, research in the Social Sciences does not have the exploitable element which is such a feature of the hard sciences, and is therefore funded by not-for-profit organisations.

At all the case study institutions, research was seen a strategic priority at the level of the institution, so that senior managers had an input into the activities of research; in the case of IoT, research was a major theme of the ATU project. At all the institutions, a senior manager was responsible for oversight of research. IoT, IoHK, and IoUK had taken the further step of identifying institutional research themes; at IoHK, for example, these were known as SRT's (strategic research themes). IoUK had identified particular geographical areas of the world where research would be focussed; though I did not see textual reference to identified areas at IoHK and IoT at the level of the institution, it was clear from the faculty/College research themes that the region in general (East and South-East Asia), and contemporary China in particular, are clear geographical foci. And still at the institutional level, collaborative working was a further strategic element of research activity. Celebrated in all the case study institutions was the notion of inter-disciplinary research; at IoC, a senior manager had been given the responsibility of overseeing this development of closer collaboration between social science disciplines.

We should now look more closely at this notion of collaborative research at the level of the faculty or College. As we have seen, all the Chinese case studies social science faculties were planning to move into adjacent buildings; it was reported that one of the advantages of this would be to facilitate closer collaborative research. Each faculty/College leader reported the greater emphasis there now was regarding collaborative or managed research. At IoT, the Dean reported a culture change in research, where the emphasis ten years ago on individual research had all but disappeared; at IoUK, the Dean spoke of the need for greater research management because if its 'industrialisation'. The faculty at IoHK had moved to a faculty-wide research project designed to engage all departments; this project appeared to me to be very interesting and relevant in its own right, but the Dean also hinted that one of the reasons behind the project was to move the local mindset in the direction of collaboration. The project at IoHK involved other universities, as mentioned previously; the Dean (Social Sciences) at IoT was also keen to point out that some of the College's research was conducted with other universities in Taiwan and the region,

and indeed with other Colleges within IoT. This was also the case at IoUK. Only at IoC was I told that there was no research being conducted with other universities.

Mentioned above is the notion that research is managed more than it once was. Practice at the case study institutions certainly supports this idea; at each institution there was mention of research review meetings, of targets and of publishing venues. IoC appeared to be somewhat adrift of the other institutions in that targets had only recently been suggested (I interpreted this statement as meaning this year) for international publishing of research results; over the next five years, it was proposed that 20 articles be published in high-impact journals from the social sciences; the other institutions appeared to have had such plans for some years. At IoUK, a research management team met with each researcher every semester to discuss her current research plans and intended venue of publication; US journals were considered preferable; at IoT, this process took place every three months, but was a paper exercise, the report going via the HOD and Dean to the ORD. At IoHK, there was as annual professional review, where targets were again involved; researchers were expected to publish four pieces over a three year cycle; again, 'US journals are preferred' (TR). Respondents at IoC and IoHK reported that there were mechanisms to encourage younger researchers; funds and advice were available at both institutions for this purpose.

What I found interesting regarding the above was that so many of the mechanisms had emerged recently; in a sense, this research project has been a moving target. As pointed out in Chapter 6 Findings, the proposal for international publishing of research results at IoC occurred very recently. My informant stated that the colleges in social sciences "are making a plan... as part of a 5 year plan... to publish at least 20 articles during this 5 year period" (CR3). He spoke in the present tense. He also told me that the decision to appoint a Vice-President as co-ordinator of cross-disciplinary research within the social sciences had occurred early in 2009, at the beginning of the second semester in February of that year.

This idea of developments occurring during the writing of this study was equally applicable to IoUK (see Chapter 5). The identification of institutional research themes, and geographical areas where the institution would "think strategically about broader relationships", were first posted on the institution's website in 2009. The identification of Ethnicity, Gender, Human Rights and Security and Governance as the research

themes for the Faculty of Social Sciences, for example, may well have merely represented some of the existing strengths within the Faculty, but what is significant is that the SMT team felt it necessary to publish these as part of what might have appeared to be a co-ordinated approach to research.

Although at IoHK many of the strategic changes had been instituted in 2006 (see Chapter 7), the drive for interdisciplinary work seemed to be current: "I believe we are living in a new regime now... interdisciplinary collaboration... is the order of the day!" (HKR1). In relation to this, the Dean and his assistant were engaged in a culture change that they believed necessary. The term culture change was also used by the Dean at IoT, referring to the shift towards a more managed research regime. Much of the infrastructure of research management seems to have been established two or three years ago.

I return to the notion that there is a new impetus to the longstanding quest to manage research more effectively, and I believe that it is the arrival of league tables in new forms which has had this effect. In all the case study institutions, the management of research was becoming increasingly tightly controlled and driven by targets. A respondent at IoT referred to the idea that research was now "part of the numbers count"; target numbers, rather than topics, were indeed mentioned at three institutions, pointing again to the significance of league tables as a driver of research activity. It is interesting that other indicators of quality have faded in response to the global league tables; the ranks in Asia Week, for example, which were first published in 1999, were not mentioned by any of the respondents.

In conclusion then, there are a number of clear similarities in the direction of research management, and the strategies used for this purpose, at the institutions under study, and that we can consider these similarities as evidence of convergence of practice, even a convergence of a culture shift. The idea of the management of research was clearly understood at all the locations I visited; the questionnaire I had developed was understood in a quite unproblematic way at all the case study institutions; there was an implicit convergence in the language of the questionnaire. At all the case study institutions, senior managers were involved with the selection of institutional research themes or the oversight of the faculty or College research activity. Inter-disciplinarity and collaborative work was celebrated and encouraged at all the case study locations.

Researchers were being asked to set targets for their research output and to tailor their writing towards particular 'high-impact' international journals. In terms of motive, I argue that league tables are at least one of the driving forces in these new or continuing directions, and that what is at stake is the reputation of these institutions.

9.3.4 Internationalisation

In this section, I look at how the respondents viewed the internationalisation of their institution, what kind of strategies they followed to foster this process, and the motives behind these strategies. At all of the case study institutions, internationalisation was a further element in the institutions' strategic direction; again, as above, similarities emerged in the way research is managed and how it is being shaped. Following this discussion, I will attempt to make a judgement as to whether these similarities constitute a convergence of practice.

It would be helpful here to remind ourselves of how internationalisation has been defined, as discussed in the Introductory Chapter:

> "...the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education." (Knight 2003:2)

Using this definition, at IoHK and IoUK, internationalisation was seen as an embedded feature for both institutions, in comparison to IoC and IoT, for historical reasons; and historically, both had a strong connection with the English-speaking academic world. This connection was not exclusive and is now certainly changing.

However, as I argue in the Chapter 2, this definition is no longer adequate, and that the process above is now integrated into an 'international dimension in higher education'. Further, I argue that this 'international dimension' is a consciousness born out of a pannier of elements which includes the presence of international students and staff, and increasing numbers of collaborative research activities, but also a politico-economic environment which supports an increasing trade in international students and an increasing mobility of staff, and last but certainly not least, the existence of global league tables for HEIs.

At IoC and IoT, it was the MoE who had decided that the process of internationalisation was crucial to the respective institutions in terms of reputation-benefits; each MoE had

identified the process as strategic to their future and was providing 'ring-fenced' resources to foster the process. IoHK and IoUK have also adopted the process of internationalisation as a strategic direction for their institutions, though these autonomous institutions do not appear to have needed the prompting of the UGC or DBIS (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills).

It is instructive to look at elements of internationalisation at these institutions to view their priorities. Respondents at each institution informed me of their aspirations regarding the numbers of international students; all hoped numbers would grow. At IoUK, this strategy was associated with resources; as demonstrated in Chapter 5, funding streams provided by postgraduate overseas students were particularly welcome at the institution because they were freer of government regulations. At IoHK and IoT, I was informed that such a growth in numbers was good for the institutions' prowess. This was particularly so at IoT, where targets were set for departments within the College of Social Sciences to advance these numbers as part of the ATU project. These targets were regularly monitored by an International Education Division of the MoE via the OIA. The intended outcome was to enrol targeted numbers of students from identified geographical areas (ATU.doc: 81), and thus to raise the profile of IoT in the league tables. The current assessment was that 'IoT scored particularly badly in... the number if international students, but that 'catching up' with other (named) institutions was attainable over the course of the next decade (ATU.doc: 19). The targeted rise in student numbers was integrated with a programme to increase the use of English as a teaching medium at the institution.

As stated, IoHK is one of those institutions where internationalisation is much more of an embedded feature of the university, a result perhaps of accidents of history, its former colonial status and the use of English as the medium of instruction. The targets for international students were set as limits for PRC students, rather than as aspiration. Nevertheless, the presence of PRC students was celebrated by the Dean as a factor in the positive rank positioning which the institution enjoyed, particularly in the THES league table; the Dean was generally relaxed about the prospects for numbers of international students in the future.

At IoC, international student numbers were growing but their modest totals had less of an impact on the atmosphere of the campus than at the other campuses. There are no

plans as yet to deliver programmes in English to international students at the university, though I was assured by a South Asian student that his PhD could be submitted in English.

At IoHK an international flavour had been assured (or engineered) by the faculty-led project to celebrate a particular nation or culture by means of displays and posters; at IoT, a new international lounge for students had been opened in the College of Social Sciences in 2009, where it was intended that only English should be used; at IoUK, the volume of international students ensured a global, or perhaps Asian, feel to the campus.

Other elements of the internationalising agenda revealed converging strategies. At all the case study institutions I was told that there were budgets for visiting scholars, for academics attending conferences, and for running conferences; IoT was particularly enthusiastic about hosting conferences, and had the financial backing of the OIA and the MoE to this end. Similarly, when it came to filling vacancies, all the case studies reported global searches, particularly for senior positions.

There appeared to be another area of convergence in the search for international partners, or rather, in the 'class' of partner each institution was seeking. At IoC, I heard about the President's anger at a member of faculty staff who had sought to collaborate with an overseas institution which he (the President) considered to be somewhat inferior. At IoHK the Dean spoke about making research links only with overseas institutions within the top 200 of the THES league table. At IoT, such links were being made with top ranking institutions in the region. At IoUK, the Vice-Chancellor sought collaboration with 'established' institutions which had a proven track record in teaching and research. There was a common interest in aligning with other 'reputable' institutions, which, of course, can lead only to a stratification of HE institutions.

The mention of the THES league table above leads us to another area of convergence: that of the motivation behind the interest in the process of internationalisation. At three of the case study institutions, respondents made reference to league tables in their discussions with me; only at IoC was this not the case. At IoT, as previously explained, the discourse of the search for reputation was the discourse of the positional ranking, as disseminated in the ATU document; since internationalisation was a metric, then it was to be addressed within the project. At IoHK and IoUK, I was assured that in the light of league tables, it was necessary to be "genuinely internationally sited" (UKR1), rather

than merely relying on any vestiges of a former prowess: "we have to perform to a standard and internationalisation is part of that" (HKR2). The league table has become the way to register reputation, the mechanism which is held in common, and thus represents a tangible convergence of input or purpose.

In conclusion then, internationalisation provides more evidence of similarities in the strategies and directions adopted at the institutions under study, and we can consider these similarities as evidence of convergence. At all the case study institutions, senior managers were involved with the selection of institutional partners and the encouragement of international activity. Interestingly, globalisation appears to have moved some institutions and geographical areas from the centre, and there is a recognition that those institutions have to prove their 'worth'. In terms of motive, I argue that league tables are at least one of the driving forces in these new or continuing directions, and that, as with research, what is at stake is the reputation of these institutions.

9.3.5 The Teaching Culture

In this section, I look briefly at how the respondents viewed the activity of teaching in their institutions; I was interested to examine what strategies were followed to foster the activity of teaching, and whether reputation building (or other motives) lay behind such strategies. It is pertinent here to remind ourselves that this research collected data only from faculties or colleges of social sciences, where research activity is rarely 'exploitable' in the way that some research is in the hard sciences. As most social science research is 'not-for-profit', one could argue that the only commercial activity, if institutions were interested in such, would be in attracting students. Bearing this in mind, would a convergence of practice emerge with regard to the activity of teaching?

At all the case study institutions, students paid fees, academic staff were expected to teach, and teaching was evaluated; the exceptions to this were at IoUK, where some staff were granted research leave, and at IoC, where only staff under the age of 60 were expected to teach. All respondents reported that a variety of teaching methods, such as lectures, seminars, discussions and student presentations, were employed; all mentioned the use of PowerPoint and other electronic aids. My impression was that at IoC, there was more emphasis on the lecture than on other teaching methods. At IoT, there was a

comment that Western pedagogy was being imported into the national system through training courses for lecturers (TR6), and at IoC, a respondent reported that he had adapted his teaching style after a year's visit to a US university.

It was at IoC and IoHK where relationships between staff and students appeared to be warmest. At IoUK, my judgement was that the relationships between staff and students were good; only at IoT was there a concerted movement by students, in the Social Sciences and other Colleges, to complain about the quality of teaching. This appeared to be a very recent phenomenon, and will be mentioned later in this section.

Some interesting ideas emerge when one attempts to analyse the approaches to teaching with regard to how reputation, in the most general of terms, is affected. IoC was the only location where I was told that student evaluations of teachers, which were compulsory for students (no evaluation, no graduation), were important in that these affected teachers' chances of promotion; positive evaluations even resulted in enhanced pay. Here, it was the reputation of individual teachers which was stressed. At IoHK, the Dean was moving to a situation where student evaluation was more, rather than less, important, in terms of contracts being renewed, as explained in Chapter 7; unfortunately I was not able to clarify at IoHK whether teaching was perceived as affecting reputation building. But at IoUK, positive evaluations of teachers were seen as an institutional matter, as I explain below.

IoUK was the only institution which reported the context of a National Student Survey (NSS) which independently made an attempt to collect data about student satisfaction with a variety of parameters, including teaching, and then ranked and reported the findings in the public domain. The NSS in particular, and student opinion in general, appeared to have a great deal of leverage at IoUK. The NSS was mentioned by a number of respondents, and was referred to in some of the documents I was able to access. As reported in Chapter 5, the Dean elect stated that recent NSS surveys had not been particularly positive with regard to certain undergraduate courses in the faculty, and she said that she would urge the relevant staff to act in ways which would elicit more favourable responses from students in the future. Also reported in Chapter 5 was the Dean's view that student opinion was becoming 'volatile' and 'difficult to manage' in the current era of instant electronic communication, and this situation clearly caused him some anxiety.

We should see the above in the context of the importance of income streams which follow students for managers at IoUK. This is particularly so for overseas students. As explained in Chapter 5, income from overseas students is particularly useful for UK SMTs because these are monies which are freer of government constraints than other income streams. The clear link between reputation, as expressed in terms of league table position, and overseas governments' support for students, has been discussed. It seems that IoUK is an exception in this study in that its reputation is explicitly bound up with student numbers. Reputation here, then, can be seen both as a 'means' to resources via reputation and as an 'end' to reputation for its own sake.

At this point, an analysis of student fees is very revealing. At all the case study institutions, there were government limitations upon the levy of fees for students; these institutions certainly do not demonstrate the free market of classical economic theory, nor of the fee-paying environment of HE in the US; quasi-markets were a feature of all the national systems under study. Yes, IoUK has some latitude in setting fees for overseas postgraduates, but that is the limit of its freedoms. The fees set at IoT, IoC and IoHK are government-imposed across a range of institutions in each nation; indeed in Taiwan and PRC, it is the public universities which have the best reputations and the lower fees, in a reverse of free market operations. So reputation is not a direct source of funds from students; rather we should see reputation, or in the case of IoUK, student satisfaction, as the currency to attract the best students.

But returning to teaching, at IoT, the activity of teaching did not loom large in the conversations I enjoyed with my various respondents. The focus for those discussions usually drifted towards building reputation through the activity of research and through internationalising, mechanisms which figured in the metrics of the global ranks, as illustrated in Chapter 3. Since the activity of teaching did not figure in these mechanisms, it was not seen as necessary to the immediate project. Naturally, the activity of teaching was of concern to staff and students at IoT, and the problem that teaching appeared to be under-emphasized in the ATU project is mentioned in the ATU document itself (ATU: 46-48), and evidenced by the student movement discussed in Chapter 8.

It may be instructive to dwell on positional ranking to explain the differences in attitude between IoT and IoUK towards the activity of teaching. Both institutions find

themselves in a very competitive national environment with relation toHE, and both are 'top ten' institutions. However, IoT is placed higher up the national rankings than is IoUK, and this may also help to explain its willingness to place teaching below other priorities. Perhaps the judgment has been made that high quality students are likely to continue to seek places at IoT despite adverse comments about teaching; at IoUK, fierce competition for able students is intensified by its position towards the lower end of the top ten ranks. In the race for reputation, does competition reduce as one moves towards the top rank?

Perhaps we should also bear in mind the notion that there may be inherently more competition amongst UK and HK universities because these institutions are not part of a collective national system, but have always enjoyed individual autonomy; it is the individual university, for example, that awards degrees, and not the MoE, as in Taiwan and PRC. The separation from policy directives, if not from purse strings, may go some way to explain my perception of a greater competitive imperative at IoUK; certainly, it was at IoUK where the greatest use was made of the language of the market place, with far more references to, for example, 'the customer component', 'client', and 'the market' than at the other institutions.

In conclusion, I found fewer pointers to convergence with regard to the use of teaching activities as a means to enhance reputation, than in the areas of research practice and the process of internationalisation. Certainly in the teaching methods themselves, there appeared to be considerable convergence in the use of a variety of practices, though this statement is based only on assertions made to me, and not on any empirical evidence. But the motives behind the strategies to improve teaching, where they exist, seemed to vary. At IoT, teaching seemed to have been ignored as the price to secure a rapid improvement in positional placement on the global ranks, simply because teaching is not a metric of these devices. At IoUK, the Dean's interest in the quality of teaching seems to be moved by a fierce competition with similar institutions or departments on the domestic scene. At IoHK, the Dean was also keen to keep abreast of the local competition within the SAR. At IoC, there were certainly carrots and sticks to improve the student experience, but I was unclear whether there were institutional motives other than the general quest to improve quality throughout the nation.

In the final chapter, I present the key findings and discuss some of the conclusions drawn. I also focus on the limitations of the study and the opportunities for further research.

Chapter 10. Conclusion

In the Introductory Chapter, I proposed that studying East Asia at this particular time is important for a number of reasons. As part of the Asia-Pacific region, the rising political and economic influence of East Asia in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has been much discussed; this rising political and economic influence is global as well as regional. I chose to study locations in the greater China not only because of its particular importance and visibility in the region, but because greater China offers so much to a comparative study of this type; as I have demonstrated in Part 2 of this study, there are great similarities in their cultural backgrounds and current economic directions, with explicit connections to the global system, but there are also great differences in terms of, for example, their political status, historical affiliation, and societal organisation. These differences have helped to underline the distinctiveness of the national context, and their place against a backdrop of homogenising global forces. I have also made the inclusion of a western location or case study a central device in the study, as it allows a point of reference against which to further judge the engagement of East Asia with global forces.

At this point it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the project, given its small scale, but rather ambitious goal, of attempting to trace the impact of globalising forces. The data was drawn in the main from only four case studies; a wider data set would inevitably produce conclusions of greater validity. The case study approach has allowed some familiarity with national systems and supra-national processes, and some illumination of these, but only a wider study on a larger scale could claim a more holistic, more nuanced perspective. And of the four cases, there was an element of pragmatism in their choice, as described in Chapter 4, and it could be argued that they represent different strata of HE institutions, thus reducing the impact of the findings. This is a particular problem when one considers the scale of HE in PRC, a problem which is referred to in more detail in a later paragraph; using data from one institution as a basis for commentary on the whole system is clearly questionable.

There are also issues regarding the sample of respondents; again, there was a strong element of pragmatism. One could argue that the focus on the perspective of the 'middle manager' skews the findings in the direction of a management perspective, but without the benefit of the view from more senior personnel; in a study which is so interested in institutional strategy, this approach leaves much to be desired. Then there are issues surrounding the language through which the data was collected. I depended on the many Chinese respondents to communicate in English; there was occasionally some misunderstanding, though this did appear to be quite rare. Despite these shortcomings, the reader may have some sympathy with the notion that the enquiry has cast a light in areas which have been inadequately explored, and which could lead to further useful enquiries: more of this later.

A reader of this study might also be sympathetic to the view expressed in the section dealing with methodological approaches (Chapter 4) that we are observing here a range of social processes. One of the premises of the study is that people or consumers are interested in (simple) information, and that the current dominant global political ideology is interested in supplying that information as a means to shape the nature of public services. The respondents at the case study institutions have found themselves caught up, to a greater or lesser degree, in the need to respond to common demands or devices created by others, and have found themselves having to react to those pressures; this resonates with Hazelkorn's assertion that institutional leaders take rankings seriously, embedding them within their strategic planning processes at all levels of the organization (Hazelkorn 2008: 196). I would argue that this is the fundamental level of convergence revealed by this piece; that faced with a common technology of the league table, many of the respondents have reported that they have reacted, either personally or as an organisational community, in much the same way, showing little cultural variance.

A restatement of the research questions will be useful here, as these will be referred to in this chapter:

- Can we observe the process of globalisation in East Asia, and can we perceive Higher Education as an instance or mechanism of globalisation?
- Is there a 'new' supra-national competitive environment which promotes globalisation in Higher Education?

- Does this 'new' supra-national environment lead to an imperative for universities to build/manage their reputations?
- Can we observe a convergence of governance in Higher Education which results from this 'new' supra-national environment?

Here I take these research questions one at a time, and make an attempt to summarise the findings. So, can we observe the process of globalisation in East Asia, and can we perceive HE as an instance or mechanism of globalisation? In the Introductory Chapter, I argued that studying HE was a useful area for global comparison, both logically and practically, claiming that the sector provides a clearly defined area of economic and social activity. Choosing an individual university as the case study unit from each nation also provides a measure of commonality, in that many of the fundamental features and purposes of 'the university' are common to all nations in the study. What the study has highlighted is that, while HE systems in the greater China and the UK remain distinctive, not only are some of the features and purposes of HE common, but the present environment (such as the political significance of KE), and many of the responses to that environment (such as NPM), are also common. At least some of that present environment in which the respondents were working was reported as being global in nature, and we can conclude that decisions taken because of this global environment represent the process or a dimension of the process of globalisation.

One illustration of this was that at all the case study institutions, I used the same interview schedule; at all the case study institutions, the questions on that schedule were understood. None of the conversations with professionals at the various locations during the study were personally taxing; indeed, each was enjoyable; this was because the participants understood the situations I was enquiring about, and usually became fully engaged, and quite often animated, with the issues under discussion. My respondents' engagement seemed to be related to the adrenalin of competition; at became clear at each location was the significance of competition within the sector, and that this competition usually went beyond national boundaries. This competition was expressed in a number of ways, not least in terms of reputation management. In other words, the interview schedule had currency at each location; that currency was reputation, apparently the common currency for all the actors involved. Since the quest for reputation went beyond boundaries, I conclude that we have observed a dimension

of the process of globalisation in the data, and that therefore I argue that HE is an instance of globalisation. However, it does not follow that all universities are involved in this globalisation process; I was studying elite institutions, or institutions which sought elite status. Now, whether HE is a mechanism of globalisation is linked with the second research question, addressed below.

Is there a 'new' supra-national competitive environment which promotes globalisation in HE? In Chapters 2 and 3 of this study, the concept of the competition state, the supra-national mechanisms of the WTO and global academic rankings were discussed. Scholars such as Jessop (for example, 2002), Cerny (1990) and Ball (2007) were quoted as proponents of the view that during that last quarter century, many nations have evolved their political and economic structures to become 'competition states', with the aim of "secur(ing) economic growth within (their) borders and/or to secure competitive advantages for capitals based in (their) borders" (Jessop 2002: 96). As demonstrated in Part 2 of this study, the literature associates KE with the search for such competitive advantages (for example, Slaughter and Leslie 1997). Thus the competitiveness of the HE system can be linked, as the pivotal producing agent of knowledge, to the competitiveness of the nation, and the global league table can be viewed as a device which compares competitiveness; competition becomes an end in itself, and is condensed into indices. I argue that this is most clearly seen in the case of IoT, as has been demonstrated. In this way, HE governance can be considered a mechanism of globalisation, rather than simply an instance of it.

But what of the supra-national mechanisms relevant to HE, discussed in Chapter 2? Only at IoT was the WTO mentioned by my respondents, perhaps because Taiwan's recent entry into the international HE market was forcing the sector, guided by the MoE, to face new challenges and opportunities. But the WTO was not mentioned at IoC, IoHK, nor at IoUK, and one wonders whether this is significant. However, with regard to the competitive environment and global academic rankings, respondents at IoHK, IoT and IoUK revealed an awareness of both, an awareness bordering on anxiety; with regard to global league tables, there was considerable detailed knowledge of the mechanisms which produced the rankings. The anxiety about rank positioning was particularly marked in the smaller-nation institutions in Hong Kong and Taiwan, perhaps magnified by the looming presence of a fast developing China. At IoUK, the anxiety seemed to be exacerbated by a resource base which appeared barely adequate to

support the quality to which all aspired. As discussed in Chapter 9, the major drivers of interest in the rankings appeared to be a cocktail of factors which included a fear of losing out to competitor regions and competitor institutions in the contest for the best students, the best staff and the best reputations, and a perceived need to achieve 'visibility' for their own institutions. In general, the issue of league tables appeared to have become more important during this present decade. There appeared to be awareness, but less interest, in these devices at IoC; I have suggested in the previous chapter some of the contextual issues which might help to explain this.

Does this 'new' supra-national environment lead to an imperative for universities to build their reputations? In Part 1, I attempted to link an increasingly marketised university sector with a perceived need for information; market theory suggests that this information might be used by students and other stakeholders. The literature suggests that despite being a simplified heuristic (or perhaps because of it) the league table may have become a powerful device in the eyes of the student consumer. It remains unclear to me whether the student stakeholder/consumer has much interest in league tables, but from the evidence I gathered, league tables are certainly of much interest to those who are involved in the management of universities. I have argued in Chapter 9 that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that league tables are one of the factors which are providing new motives to manage reputation. My informants suggested that they were involved, more or less directly, in a variety of strategies which revolved around enhancing reputation; these in turn centred on the core activities of research and teaching, attracting high quality staff, and promoting an international environment. At all the case study institutions, senior managers were involved, for example, with the selection of institutional research themes, the oversight of the faculty or College research activity, with the promotion of inter-disciplinary and collaborative work, and with target-setting for their research output. At all the case study institutions, senior managers were involved with the selection of institutional partners and the encouragement of international activity.

But can we link these converging activities to an increasingly marketised sector? In the case studies from greater China, as with IoUK, what we are observing is a quasi-market, where some of the forms of the market are in evidence, but not all of the forms. There are student fees, but these are flat across institutions of different reputation-status, or, as pointed out earlier, even inverse. And there are significant costs in promoting

reputation, in the form of higher wages and an enhanced built environment. But in this new market, reputation is the currency; it attracts the best students, the best researchers, the largest research grants, and has the potential of contributing to the drive towards a knowledge economy which will ensure the nation's future prosperity. In this respect we can view reputation as both a means and an end.

Can we observe a convergence of governance in HE which results from this 'new' supra-national environment? We should remind ourselves of the central notions of convergence as used in this study, detailed in the Introductory Chapter; is there movement over time towards 'a condition of becoming alike' (Bennett 1991: 219)? Is there a sufficient time period here, and are there sufficient measures, to allow for some certainty in the results? Are we observing simple or paradigm convergence (Ball op.cit:198)? Are we observing input, process, output or policy convergence (Hay op.cit:514)?

I stated in Part 1 that governance was to be the hinge of this project, and that if one could observe a convergence of governance across the case study institutions, then that would suggest that the process of globalisation was evident. I argue in Chapter 9 that the 'new' supra-national environment has given an added certainty to the direction in which managers feel the need to travel. This certainty may be misplaced; it may not tally with all the values and purposes of the institution, but it is nevertheless compelling. The data suggests that the importance of reputation has been enhanced and the rankings which contribute to the perception of reputation have provided common templates for all to follow, irrespective of context (all, that is, those who wish to play on this particular stage); the result is a paradigm convergence, where common underlying principles and operational effects (on practitioners, practice and institutional procedures, as suggested by Ball) are evident. I argue that these templates present another imperative (there are other imperatives, as discussed) towards a centrally directed, strategically driven organisational framework; the details of this framework may differ from one Institution to another, as Vaira suggests, but since motives and outcomes are shared, the notion of 'organisational allomorphism' is justified. To be clear about this, my respondents were in a position to understand the pressures upon senior managers, and the evidence suggests a convergence of inputs (the pressures upon a particular political economy, as theorised by Hay) which drove strategic objectives in the case study institutions. I do not claim that 'dean-ing' is a convergent experience, though

some of that experience may be so; the role of the dean appears to be locally contingent, bounded by the contexts of the institution and its national setting. But in looking at the experience of the dean, we can see policy and output convergence (policies and the effects and outcomes of those policies, as theorised by Hay) at different universities in different national settings. As discussed in detail in Chapter 9 of this study, this convergence centres on oversight of research activity, involvement with the selection of institutional partners, encouragement of international activity, and to a lesser extent, oversight of teaching activities.

Earlier in this piece I have quoted from Hazelkorn's (2007, 2008) work relating to the impact of league tables upon the internal dynamics of HEIs. Her respondents were largely European; she found that a majority of respondents (who were in senior positions) had developed formal internal mechanisms for reviewing their rank positioning, and were taking strategic, operational, management and/or academic decisions as a result of the 'arrival' of league tables. Though this research did not seek to engage with the same cadre of respondents, the evidence is nevertheless compelling that the impact of league tables upon HEIs in China is very similar, particularly in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Though I conclude that this convergence is both a response to and an instantiation of the process of globalisation, in that the case studies in East Asia and the UK exhibited common strategic and operational threads (which continue to develop), it does not mean that these institutions are any less distinctive. My interpretation of the data does not suggest that the institutions of East Asia are becoming more like institutions in the West, rather that both are becoming more like each other (a form of process convergence), in that they are responding to, and hence reinforcing, the same model, the model or models imposed by the global league tables.

My evidence has not suggested that, during the timescale of the study, the institutions of East Asia are following the actions of Western institutions. IoT, for example, set out its institutional strategic research themes a clear three years before IoUK. It has not been the focus of this study to sequence recent governance changes (relevant to this study) at the case study institutions; my impression is the IoHK and IoT may have been a little ahead of the game in relation to IoUK in this regard, and that IoC may have lagged by a year or two. Comparing the sequence of change would certainly be an interesting

adjunct to this study. The point is that (HE) SMTs in East Asia and the UK and elsewhere seem to have been reacting, and are reacting to, the new supra-national HE environment, in similar ways, and within the same time-frame. But is the time-frame of this study sufficient to observe convergence? Perhaps it is too short a time period, but does not the volume and nature of the evidence itself override this objection?

My data also suggests that East Asian HE institutions remain distinctive, different from one another, and bounded by their national contexts. Perhaps this is most apparent with respect to IoC, where it seems that the mechanisms (M) of globalisation do not overwhelm the context (C) in the same way as in Taiwan and Hong Kong; perhaps we can interpret this as a case of 'China exceptionalism'. There were clues in the data as to why this should be so, relating to the control of the MoE, regarding planning and promotion of various projects; IoC was clearly part of a vast centralised enterprise, coordinated from Beijing, though there was also evidence of provincial involvement and institutional initiatives. Equally apparent was the involvement of the CCP at all levels of the institution, revealing to us that the purposes of the institution go beyond education; Zhou, for example, states that the MoE "calls upon all universities to take tangible steps to improve their students" overall moral and educational standards' (Zhou op.cit:10). Thus the purposes of the university in PRC spill over into ideology, into recruitment for the Party and exposition of its policies, perhaps even into social control, and certainly into economic planning: I reiterate the mantra that every part of the Chinese (PRC) state serves the CCP, including universities.

Now let us consider IoT and IoHK, where the mechanisms (M) of globalisation do appear to have overwhelmed the context to produce very similar outcomes (O). IoT is another institution which finds itself within a highly centralised HE system; like its mainland counterpart (in this study), it lies within the control of wider government policies relating to the future of Taiwan's economic direction, but not, or no longer, within one party political control. IoT was also distinctive in its governance arrangements, also highly centralised, its Colleges being driven by offices of research and international affairs. Whilst there were Party officials at IoC, there were government civil servants operating within IoT. In contrast, IoHK is an autonomous legal entity, proud of a governance style shaped by its previous colonial masters, but engaging with the twenty-first century through a radical recentralisation at the a level of the faculty; but like IoT, it is also a part of the SAR's economic vision of a service-rich

hub for the region. So the evidence suggests that in East Asian HE institutions, a convergence of practice can take place in faculty operations, though management structures remain contextually bound.

Having reviewed the research questions above, I now reflect back on the global contexts and discuss how the globalisation of HE might evolve in the future, and how that might affect East Asia. Part B of the study commented on the changes in HE during the second half of the twentieth century. Perhaps we should see this period as one of turmoil, of foment in HE; there was 'local' massification, a changing global political landscape, the WTO, the recognition of the need for economies based on knowledge, and the moves towards public accountability. Perhaps there was a decline in tacit knowledge about the university system, and certainly little idea about how trans-continental systems fitted together. Perhaps global league tables emerged into this era of global disturbance, at a time when a formalisation of the current state of play, some measure of codification, was needed. Should we view the different modes of information which were available to stakeholders, such as the Quality Assurance data of individual nations, as somehow insufficient at this moment in time? The league table offers a simplistic heuristic, a short cut in a complex world, an heuristic which is emblazoned by the oxygen of media attention; as I have suggested before, perhaps it is those who work in HE who are most animated by these metrics. Does the league table provide a set of rules within the confusion outlined above? Are they therefore welcomed by university presidents, by governing bodies, by SMTs, because they provide an external legitimacy? As I write, there is no alternative which offers such external legitimacy, and it is this which appears to be at the forefront of those managing such institutions as IoHK, IoUK and IoT.

Another area of interest regarding league tables is the interrelationship between the public sphere and the private sphere, which we can observe being acted out in the arena of positional ranking; the neo-liberal era appears to be one where the private and the public are in real flux. There is little *direct* national government contribution to league tables for HE, though clearly the audit and accountability cultures of the neo-liberal provide some of the data (for example, the RAE); thus league tables present an example of that public underpinning of private devices, and the growth of private standards setting. This is an era when the collision of private and public have enabled these devices; increasingly we now see some governments using them in their decision

making. In this context it is interesting to see the PRC's reticence towards the league table; data from this study aligns the CCP's attitude towards the league table with western academics who decry their simplicity. The Chinese government seems less moved by public, or perhaps media, demand for them. And when we mention demand, again, we have to be aware that though this study reveals an intense interest in league tables amongst university leaders, there is no clear evidence (beyond this study) which shows that this interest is matched by the student/consumer.

Perhaps the arrival of the league tables represents a tipping point; this form of standards has become predominant because it has attained a level of usage which has driven out other standards. Some commentators have suggested that with regard to globalisation, outside standards appear to privilege and re-enforce the established (for example, Enders 2009). League tables provide a communication about certain standards which reinforce the patterns of those who have already achieved success; as Moodie asserts, "world university league tables... reflect the interests and values of researchers" (Moodie op.cit:76). If we look at which institutions do not do well in positional ranking, we find the non-English, the new universities, the developing world, open access journals, and universities with few international staff/students; institutions which do not compare well against the performatives of the established.

As suggested in Chapter 4 in relation to Realism's ontological position and Bourdieu's interpretations, it is through a social process that we can understand the dominance of these new standards, recognising the existence of discipline-based epistemological elites which have great influence in determining global standards in HE. Few would argue that these standards of the academic world are Western, and emerge largely from English speaking, older institutions. Why should East Asian institutions be prepared to accept these standards? The data in this study has pointed to the perception that reputation-based benefits are a prize worth competing for, certainly in Taiwan and in Hong Kong.

What appears to make the reputation race in HE worthwhile is that reputation provides not just a symbolic capital, but also a material base. An advantageous positional ranking allows reputation-based access to resources; for example, in the case of IoT, a high rank allows access to other well-resourced partners and to the possibility of research monies, whether those are supplied by government or philanthropists. And the

project to enhance IoT's reputation is also expected to produce reputation-benefits for the whole nation, to cement the nation's reputation as a player and partner in the HE of the region; similarly for IoHK. In the case of IoUK, overseas students and their governments may only consider institutions with a high reputation. Interestingly, as we saw in the Chapter 6, the reputation-resources formula does not seem to work in reverse, at least not in the short- and medium-term; a well-resourced institution does not necessarily command a good reputation. This would seem to indicate that in general, once reputation and resources are achieved, it is a closed market, adding to the argument above that the advantages seem to flow to the established core; in this sense, we can see a reputation-inertia.

Where will East Asian institutions go from here? Are there alternatives to the present regime of league tables and the metric of reputation? We have seen in Chapter 3 that the authority of league tables is still contested. It has been suggested that the race for positional ranking fuels an expensive race, "a VC's arms race", as it has been described by previous UK VC, Roger King (King 2009), echoing the previously used term 'intellectual arms race" (Moodie op.cit: 76). King asserts that the more an institution is involved in the race for reputation, the more costly it is. The race fuels iso-morphism, mimicking and homogeneity, spending sprees which have the potential to wreck the financial stability of an institution, even a parroting in corporate literature. At a personal level, the race is the cause of personal anxiety (King, ibid) or worse; the President of IoT was taken seriously ill in October 2009 as a direct result of the strain of his efforts with the ATU project (e-mail from TR2, Nov 2009).

Many argue that positional ranking provides an over-simplistic template, and have asked whether it is fit for the purpose of assisting the student/consumer with information about an appropriate location for study (Enders 2009); this is a question clearly beyond the remit of this study, but has some pertinence here. Certainly the aim of this study, underpinned by the critical realism approach, has been to explain, rather than to predict; nevertheless, I might be allowed a little future gazing here. Scholars agree that there is a need for a more multi-dimensional model, that there is a need to pay respect to the different purposes and multi-functionality of the university; certainly there is a need to add teaching and learning as a metric, particularly for an East Asian community which has a long standing reverence for these. Perhaps the PRC has the will and capacity to combat the private simplicity of the league table with more

collective forms of deliberation; this is supposition. Against this, we have to ask if such a task would be considered worth the effort, and whether it would benefit the Party. But the dominant view is a more pragmatic one, as evidenced by much of the data in this study, and it appears to be that one has to accept the status quo. This position is exemplified by Mok's rally call to the Asian epistemological community to "Stand on Two Feet" (Mok 2007). Mok accepts the dominance of Western scholarship, accepts the need to write in English, and in targeted journals; but he also encourages Asian scholars to develop their own distinctive traditions.

Some of the evidence herein suggests that there is a groundswell of opinion in East Asia that takes offence at the Western domination of the accepted quality standards in HE, that recognises the need to pay respect to local conditions and traditions, to assert the values of the institution, and not to give in to the reductionist process of the league table (see for example, TR4 and HK2). I suggest a number of factors may point to the possibility of change in this regard. There is the growing confidence of the political leadership of Asia in the twenty-first century, and a tradition of intervention. Many East Asian universities are relatively disadvantaged in the rankings, despite discernable improvements in the quality of HE, and despite the prediction that the lion's share of global research will soon be undertaken in Asia (Scott 2007). The shortcomings of the league table are now understood. The era of foment in HE, in the latter part of the last century, is beginning to settle. I argue that because of these factors it is likely that new forms of standards are likely to emerge in Asia, and that the life-cycle of the league table as a product is nearing its end. Perhaps what will determine the continuance of the credibility of the league table is whether the breakneck race for reputation will suit the purposes of HE in East Asia, and more importantly for national economies in East Asia, as the century develops.

Following on from the notion above regarding political economies at the macro scale, it is timely to ask where this research might go from here. One route would be to examine the 'China exceptionalism' which has been frequently referred to in the latter part of this project, and to look more closely at HE governance regimes in the PRC. What has emerged from the data here is the scale of the differences in power relationships and social relationships in the PRC, and how these differences appear to influence attitudes and operations within the sector. One might ask, for example, how is the collegial ideal perceived in China? King asserts that the 'developmental state' approach in East Asia is

increasingly undermined, and that state economic development societies increasingly adapt to globalisation and its governance practices (King 2009: 25); I am unconvinced by this argument with regard to the influence of the state in HE in the PRC, and by implication, with some of the assumptions of the EGM (emerging Global Model) of university governance. I reason that it is the scale of HE in the PRC that makes this an area of enquiry worth pursuing: of the 17,000 HE institutions globally (Hazelkorn 2008), nearly 3000 (2029 public, 710 private) are in the PRC; of the 150 million HE students in the world (Dale 2010), 23 million are in China; Chinese HE employs nearly a million university teachers (Zhou 2006). My initial research into this general area of HE governance, where I collaborate with Chinese researchers, suggests that the HE governance regime in the PRC is still dominated by a 'command and control' model, with intense Party involvement, where competition and reputation management have to wrestle with other political priorities. As King observes, rankings seems quite suited to contemporary HE systems that are generally composed of autonomous institutions, which are likely to bridle at direct command and control legislation, not least from the state (King 2009:159); clearly this is not the situation in the PRC. It is worth re-stating that in the PRC one might argue that the mechanisms (M) of globalisation do not overwhelm the context (C), and an examination of this would be fascinating.

Another area of research which leads on from this project is the study of governance at the level of the institution. Here I have in mind the rather interesting model of the IoT. The mechanisms of globalisation do seem to have primacy over other energies influencing the intended outcomes at IoT, but again we see the 'developmental state' approach, where steering by the state could hardly be described as 'at a distance'. An analysis of this joint national project, in which the Ministry of Education is as deeply involved as the personnel of the university would, I venture, make interesting reading. Further regional extensions into models in Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and Japan would add depth to notions of HE governance in other developmental states, as would studies into the semi-elite or aspirant HEI's in East and South East Asia.

At a more abstract level, this study leads naturally into critiques of competition as a driver of institutional governance and the nature and effects of the reputation game amongst HEI's, leading this research into the normative. What are the consequences of the systematic subordination to the logic of competition at the 'anglo' university? Do we already have a research proletariat controlled by epistemic 'leaders' or research

capitalists? Which HE systems (PRC? Venezuela/Cuba?) remain outside the competition model, and why?

Finally, it has been a privilege to have been engaged with this research, and I hope that I have been able to make a contribution to our understanding of contemporary developments of HE governance. I do not take a normative stance, but simply report, as far as one can, the empirical results; my perspective is outside the value system of HE. I argue that what I have demonstrated is an emergence of convergence around operations in HE institutions, and that this represents an isomorphism at a level of institutional governance that has not been recognised before; thus we can now think of HE in different ways. I do not claim 'a totalising convergence theory'; rather, I show that there can be convergence at one level (but not at all levels). Nor do I claim a convergence of operational arrangements; what has been fascinating is that the institutions under study have developed different structures which aim to achieve certain goals. However I do claim that I have demonstrated a convergence of governance instruments, designed to address certain common goals. At the centre of these governance instruments is the perceived need to maintain, protect, or enhance institutional reputation. That institutional reputations are addressed and managed with different structures reflects public policy interventions which differ from one nation state to another, a 'glocalisation' or 'hybridisation', where a range of organisational forms, practices and cultures within different national and local contexts, can be observed. Despite these differences there appears to be a common recognition of, and response to, the concept of reputation and what is required to achieve reputation. I claim that what I have demonstrated is outside the current parameters of the debate regarding the globalisation of HE, which focuses upon the trade in students and the strategic reactions of managers to that trade and other forms of academic capitalism; what I have demonstrated exposes the limitations of these literatures. But the concentration upon reputation management is of great significance: one critique is that there is a gravitation of resources to places of excellence, resulting from the emphasis upon the global competitive environment and the control of the reputation system by institutional leaders.

I hope that I have also made a contribution in relation to our knowledge relating to the situation of HE in greater China; one area of special interest is the depth of PRC exceptionalism, where the ideology of competition meets the ideology of the

developmental state. PRC provision is a very large piece of the HE cake; the governance I have observed in two elite HEIs does not match the entrepreneurial/self-directed/self reliant, 'anglo' model, upon which most of the literature focuses (though I do not assume a common governance model throughout the PRC). And significantly, this research has taken the notions of globalisation and the internationalisation of HE's and reported on them in the context of 'the three Chinas', where they are too infrequently commented on. I hope I have teased out a more precise definition of the internationalisation of HE, and have demonstrated that the perceptions of the internationalisation of HEIs can be quite different from one institution to another. I trust that this study has also had something to add to the questions of impact and influence on HEI's of particular global mechanisms, and policymaking within HE. It has been a fascinating journey for me, one which I could not have undertaken but for the kindness and assistance of many along the road. And it is my good fortune that the journey has not ended here: as a result of the conceptual turns I have made, I find myself with several tracks ahead of me, wondering which one to continue down!

Bibliogaphy

Aim for Top University Project (ATU) 2008. Taipei, IoT

Altbach, P. 2001. *Higher Education and the WTO: Globalisation Run Amok.* From http://www.universite-toplum.org, accessed on 26/4/07

Archer, C. 2001. *International Organisations.* London, Routledge

Ball, S. 1994. 'Researching inside the state: issues in the interpretation of Elite interviews' in Halpin,D. and Troyna B. (Eds) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological issues.* The Falmer Press

Ball, S. 1999. 'Labour, Learning and the Economy: A Policy Sociology Perspective'. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 29(2) pp. 195-205

Ball, S. 2007. *Education plc: Understanding Private Sector Participation in Public Sector Education.* Abingdon, Routledge

Ball, T. 2001."Imagining Marketopia," *Dissent* 48(3) pp. 74-80

Ballantyne, B. 2009. *Beating the Odds: Causes and Conditions for Policy Persistence in the case of Reading Recovery.* An unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Auckland

Bashir, S. 2007. *'Trends in International Trade in Higher Education: Implications and Options for Developing Countries'.* Washington D.C., World Bank Publications

Bayliss, J and Smith, S. 2001. *The Globalization of World Politics.* Oxford, Oxford University Press

BBC 2008. Accessed online http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/8263672.stm on 25/8/2008

Begg, D., Fisher, S. and Dornbusch, R. 1991. *Economics*. London: McGraw Hill.

Bello, W. and Rosenfeld, S. 1992. *Dragons in distress: Asia's miracle economies in crisis.* Oxford, Penguin Books

Bellows, C.J. 1976. 'Taiwan's foreign policy in the 1970s: A case study of adaptation and viability'. *Asian Survey* 16 (7) pp. 593-610

Bennett, C. J., 1991. What is policy convergence and what causes it? *British Journal of Political Science.* 21 pp. 215-233

Bennett, C. J., 1992. *Regulating Privacy: Data Protection and Public Policy in Europe and the United States.* NY: Cornell University Press.

Bhaskar, R. 1978. *A Realist theory of science.* Hassocks: Harvester Press

Bhaskar, R. 1989. *The Possibility of naturalism: A philosophical critique of the contemporary human sciences*. Hassocks: Harvester Press

Bhaskar, R. 1989. *Reclaiming reality: A Critical introduction to contemporary philosophy.* London: Verso.

Bhaskar, R. 1997. *A Realist Theory of Science*. New York and London: Verso

Bhaskar, R. 1998. *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences*. New York and London: Routledge.

Bhaskar, R. 2009. From a seminar given by Roy Bhaskar at the Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol, September 2009

Brewer, D., Gates, S. M. and Goldman, C. A. 2002. *In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in US Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press

Bleikie, I. 2009. *Organisation and Governance in Higher Education.* A World Universities Network virtual seminar. 9/2/2009

Boli, J. and Thomas, G.M. 1997: 'World Culture in a World Polity:A Century of International Non-Governmental Organization'. *American Sociological Review* 62 (2) pp. 171-190

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *Sociology in Question.* Translated by R.Nice. London, Sage

Bourdieu, P. 1998. 'L'essence du neo-liberalisme/The essence of Neo-Liberalism' from *Le Monde Diplomatique* March

Bowden, R. 2000. 'Fantasy higher education: university and college league tables'. *Quality in Higher Education* 6(1) pp. 41–60

British Council 2003. *Vision 2020: Forecasting International Student Mobility – A UK Perspective*

Bromley, D. 2002. 'Comparing Corporate Reputations: League Tables, Quotients,Benchmarks, or Case Studies?' *Corporate Reputation Review* 5(1) pp. 35-50

Bulmer, M. 2008. 'The ethics of Social Research' in Gilbert, N. (Ed) *Researching Social Life.* Sage, London

Cerny, G. 1990. *The Changing Architecture of Politics: Structure, Agency, and the Future of the State*. London, Sage

Clark, B.R. 1983 *The Higher Education System: Academic Organisation in Cross-National Perspective*. The University of California Press, California

Clarke, M., 2005. 'Quality Assessment Lessons from Australia and New Zealand '. *Higher Education in Europe* 30 (2) pp. 183-197

Chen, I. 2006. 'GDPism and Risk: Challenges for Social Development and Governance in East Asia'. From a conference at University of Bristol, July 2006

Chen, D. and Lo, W. 2007. 'Critical reflections of the approaches to quality in Taiwan's higher education'. *The Journal of Comparative Asian Development* 6(1) pp. 165–186

Chen, S. 1997. 'Taiwan' in Postglione, G. & Mak, G.(Eds) *Asian Higher Education: An International Handbook and Reference Guide.* Conn, Greenwood Press

Chiu, P.H. 2006. *'Implications of Moving with the Times: Construing a Response to budget Cuts at City University of Hong Kong'.* An unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Bristol

Chow, G. 1985. 'Higher Education and the Labour Market in Hong Kong'. *Education Journal/Chinese University, Hong Kong.* 13 (1) pp.37-47

Crotty, M. 1998. *The Foundations of Social Research.* Sydney, Allen and Unwin.

Creswell, J.W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design.* Sage

Currie, J. and Newson, J. (Eds) 1998. *Globalization and the Universities.* London, Sage

Currie, J. 2003. 'Globalization's Impact on the Professoriate in Anglo-American Universities', in *The Professoriate: Profile of a Profession.* Welch, A. (Ed.) Amsterdam, Kluwer.

Dale, R. 2000. 'Globalization and education: demonstrating a 'common world educational culture' or locating a 'globally structured educational agenda'?' *Educational Theory* 50 (4) pp. 427-448.

Dale, R. 2005. 'Globalisation, Knowledge Economy and Comparative Education'.

Comparative Education 41 (2) pp. 117-149

Danermark, B., Ekstrom, M., Jacobsen, L. and Karlsson, J.C. 2002. *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences.* London, Routledge

Dearing Report: *Higher Education in the Learning Society: Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* HMSO, 1997

Deem, R., Mok, K.H., and Lucas, L. 2008. 'Transforming Higher Education in Whose Image? Exploring the Concept of the `World-Class' University in Europe and Asia'. *Higher Education Policy* 21 (1) pp. 83-97.

DfES 2004. *Putting the World into World Class Education.* London, Department for Education and Science

Delanty, G., and Strydom, P. 2003. (Eds) *Philosophies of Social Science.* Maidenhead Philadelphia, Open University Press

de Vaus, D. A., 2001. *Research Design in Social Research.* London: Sage

de Wit, H. 2002. *Internationalisation of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, Greenwood Press

Dill, D. 2009. 'Convergence and Diversity: The Role and Influence of University Rankings' in Kehm, B. Stensaker, B. 2009. *University Rankings, Diversity and the New Landscape of Higher Education.* Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, Sense

Dill, D. D. and Teixeira, P. 2000. 'Program diversity in higher education: An economic perspective'. *Higher Education Policy*, 13 (1), pp. 99–117.

DiMaggio, P., and Powell, W. 1983. *'The Iron Cage Re-visited: Institutional Isomorhism and Collective Rationality in Organisational Fields'.* American Sociological Review 48:147-60.

Drysdale, P. (Ed) 2000. *Reform and recovery in East Asia: the role of the state and economic enterprise*. Routledge London

Duan, X.R. 2003. "Chinese Higher Education Enters a New Era" *Academe* 89 (6) (American Association of University Professors) online at http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2003/ND/Feat/duan.htm, accessed on 10/1/08

Elkin, G., Devjee, F. and Farnsworth, J. 2005. 'Visualising the Internationalization of Universities.' *International Journal of Education Management* 19(4) pp. 318-329

Enders, J.: 2004. 'Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory'. *Higher Education* (47) 3 pp. 361-382

Epstein, E.H. & Kuo, W.F. 1991. 'Higher Education'. In Smith, D.C. (Ed) *The Confucian Continuum: Educational Modernization in Taiwan.* New York: Praeger Publishers

Etherington, K. 2004. *Becoming a Reflexive Researcher.* London: Jessica Kingsley

Fenby, J. 2008. *The Penguin History of Modern China.* London, Penguin

Federkeil, G. 2009. '*Reputation Indicators in Rankings of Higher Education Institutuions'*, In Kehm, B. Stensaker, B. *University Rankings, Diversity and the New Landscape of Higher Education.* Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, Sense

Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man.* London: Hamilton

Fukuyama, F. 2006. *After the Neocons.* London, Profile Books Ltd

Fombrun, C. 1996. *Reputation: realizing value from the corporate image.* Harvard Business School Press: Boston, Massachusetts

Fombrun, C. and Van Riel, C. 1997. The Reputational Landscape. *Corporate Reputation Review* 1(1-2), pp. 5-13.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J.H. 2005. 'Interviewing: the Art of Science', in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. 2005. (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, California, Sage

Gilbert, N. From an article in The Guardian 30/01/2007

Gilbert, N. (Ed) 2008. *Researching Social Life.* Sage London

Gillam, B. 2005. *Research Interviewing.* Maidenhead, Open University Press

Giroux, H. 2002. 'Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere'. *Harvard Educational Review 72 (4) pp.425-464*

Green, N., 2008. 'Formulating and Refining a Research Question'. in Gilbert *Researching Social Life.* London, Sage

Greenwood, R. and Hinings, C.R. 1996. 'Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism'. *The Academy of Management Review* 21(4) pp. 1022-105

Gudykunst, W. 2000. 'Methodological Issues in Conducting Theory-Based Cross-Cultural Research'. in Spencer-Oatey, H. *Culturally Speaking.* London, Continuum

Hammersley, M. 2003. '*Recent Radical Criticism of Interview Studies'* in 'Qualitative Interviewing', University of Essex 2004, Essex Summer School

Hantrais, L. and Mangen, S. 1996. (Eds) *Cross National Research Methods in the Social Scienc.* London, Pinter

Harvey, D. 2005. *Neoliberalism.* New York, Oxford University Press

Harvey, P. 2001. 'Going Back to the Future?' in Warner, D. & Palfreyman, D. (Eds) *The State of UK Higher Education.* SRHE/OUP Buckingham

Hatch, M. J., with Cunliffe, A. 2006 *Organisational Theory.* Oxford, Oxford University Press

Hazelkorn, E. 2008. 'Learning to live with league tables and ranking: the experience of Institutional leaders.' *Higher Education Policy,* 21(2) pp. 193-215

Hazelkorn, E. 2007. 'The Impact of League Tables and Ranking Systems on Higher Education Decision Making.' *Higher Education Management and Policy,* 19 (2) pp. 87-110 (OECD)

Heinrich, C.J. & Lawrence, L.E. 2000. Washington, *Governance and Performance.* Georgetown University Press

Held, D. 2004. *Global Covenant : the social democratic alternative to the Washington consensus.* Oxford, Polity

Held, D. & McGraw, A. (Eds) 2000. *The global Transformations Reader: an Introduction to the Globalization Debate.* Malden, Mass, Polity Press

Hey, V. 2009. From a Seminar during a workshop at the University of Bristol: 'The 21st Century University, the Economy and the Organization of Academic Work - Lessons from the Past and Present'. 5/6/2009. (Professor Valerie Hey, School of Education, University of Sussex)

Hantrais, L. and Mangen, S. 1996. (Eds)*Cross national research methods in the Social Sciences.* London, Pinter

HEPI (Higher Education Policy Institute), 2004. 'Internationalisation in Higher Education: A Review', at www.hepi.ac.uk/pubdetail.asp, accessed 25/05/06

DES (Department of Education and Science) 1987. *Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge.* London, HMSO

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences*. Beverley Hills, CA., Sage

Hofstede,G. and Bond, M.H. 1984. 'Hofstede's Culture Dimensions'. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 15, pp.417-433

Holliday, A., Hyde, M. and Kullman, J. 2004. *Intercultural communication :an advanced resource book.* London, Routledge

Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, G.F. 1995. *The Active Interview.* Thousand Oaks, California, Sage

Hood, C. 1995. 'The new public management in the 1980's: Variations on a theme'. *Accounting, organisations and Society* 20 (2/3) pp. 93-109

Hughes, P. 2007. *Political and Civil Contests and their Imprints on the Cityscape of Taipei City.* An unpublished Masters thesis, University of Bristol

Jarratt Report 1985. Report of the steering committee on efficiency studies in universities (the Jarratt Report). CVCP, London

Jessop, B. 2002. *The future of the capitalist state.* Oxford: Polity Press

Jobbins, D. 2005. 'Moving to a Global Stage: A Media View'. *Higher Education in Europe* 30:2 pp. 137 — 145

Jongbloed, B. 2005. 'Marketisation in Higher Education, Clark's Triangle and the Essential Ingredients of Markets'. *Higher Education Quarterly* 57(2) pp. 110–135

Kain, R. 2008. Intensive interview with Roger Kain, Pro-vice Chancellor, University of Exeter, February 2008

Kant, I. 1795. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated 1986 by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. London, Dent

Kerr, C. 1983. *The Future of Industrial Societies: Convergence or Continuing Diversity?* Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press

Kehm, B. Stensaker, B. 2009. *University Rankings, Diversity and the New Landscape of Higher Education.* Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, Sense

Kickert, W., 1995. 'Steering at a Distance: A New Paradigm of Public Governance in Dutch Higher Education'. *Governance* 8 (1) pp. 135 – 157

Kim, S. 2000. *East Asia and globalization.* Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield

Kincheloe, J. L., & McClaren, P., 2002. Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research in Ethnography and Schools in Zou, Y. and Trueba, E. H., T., (Eds) *Ethnography and Schools: Qualitative approaches to the study of education* (pp. 87-138). Maryland, Rowman and Littlefield

King, R. 2010. *Governing knowledge globally: policy internationalism and higher education in the age of globalisation* in Brennan, J. et al., Higher Education and Society: A research report. CHERI, London. Accessed on line at oro.open.ac.uk on 24/8/10

King, R. 2009. *Governing Universities Globally: Organizations, Regulation and Rankings,* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kjaer, A.M. 2004. *Governance.* Cambrdge, Polity Press

Kerr, C. 1983. *The future of Industrial Societies: Convergence or Continuing Diversity?* Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press

Knight, J. 2002. *The Trade in Higher Education Services: the implications of GATS.* From www.obhe.ac.uk, accessed on 24/4/07

Knight, J. 2003. 'GATS, Trade and Higher Education. Perspective 2003 - Where are we?' *The Observatory Report on Higher Education.* accessed online on 20/3/10

Knight, J. 2004. 'Internationalization Remodelled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales'. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8 (1) pp.5-31

Knight, J. 2006. *Higher Education Crossing Borders. A Guide to the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) for Cross-Border Education* Vancouver, Commonwealth of Learning. Accessed online at http://www.col.org

Le Grand, J. and Bartlett, W. 1993. (Eds) *Quasi-markets and Social Policy.* London, MacMillan

Li, L. 2005. *Examining Globalisation and Convergence.* A Doctoral Thesis, University of Auckland

Li, T. 2008. Intensive interview with the President of Taipei Municipal Teachers University, Taiwan

Liu, N.C., and Liu, L.2005. 'University Rankings in China'. *Higher Education in Europe* 30(2) pp. 217 — 227

Loftland, J.1971. *Analysing Social Settings.* Belmont California, Wadsworth

Lucas, L. 2006. *The Research Game in Academic Life.* Maidenhead, Open University Press

Mak, G.and Postiglione, G., 1997. 'Hong Kong' in Postiglione, G. & Mak, G.(Eds) *Asian Higher Education: An international Handbook and Reference Guide.* Conn, Greenwood Press

Malpass, P. and King, A. 2009. *Bristol's Floating Harbour.* Bristol, Redcliffe Press

Marginson, S., 2007. *Global university rankings: where to from here?* A paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Association for International Education

National University of Singapore, March 2007, accessed on line 5/08/08 at UoB

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. 2000. *The Enterprise University* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G., 2002. 'Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic'. *Higher Education* 43 pp.281–309

Markus, H.R. and Kitayama, S. 1991. 'The Cultural Psychology of Personality', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 98, pp. 224-253

Marsh, D. & Furlong, P. 2002. *Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science* in Marsh, D. and Stoker G.(Eds) *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. Hampshire, McMillan Palgrave

Mattelart, A. 2000. *Networking the World, 1794-2000*, trans. Liz Carey-Libbrecht and James A. Cohen, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press

Mayntz, R. 2003. 'New Challenges to Governance Theory'. In Bang, H.P. (Ed) *Governance as social and political communication*. Manchester, Manchester University Press

McDaniel, O. 1996. 'The Paradigms of Governance in Higher Education Systems'. *Higher Education Policy* 9 (2) pp. 137-158

Merisotis, J. & Sadlak, J. 2005. 'Higher Education Rankings: Evolution, Acceptance and Dialogue'. *Higher Education in Europe* 30(2) pp.97-101

Miles, M .B. 1979. 'Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance: The Problem of Analysis'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24(4) pp. 590-601

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California, Sage

Mills, S. 2003. *Michel Foucault.* London, Routledge

Min, W. 1997. 'China' in Postiglione, G. & Mak, G.(Eds) *Asian Higher Education: An international Handbook and Reference Guide*. Conn, Greenwood Press

Ministry of Education, People's Republic of China, 1998. The Action Plan to Visualise Education Towards the 21st Century. Beijing.

Ministry of Education, People's Republic of China, 2004. from www.moe.ed.cn/english/higher accessed on 7/11/07

Mok, K H. 2003. 'Globalisation and Higher Education Restructuring in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Mainland China'. *Higher Education Research and Development* 22 (2) pp.117-129

Mok, K. H. 2006a. Intensive interview conducted in Bristol, 6/11/06

Mok, K. H. 2006b. *Education Reform and Education Policy in East Asia* London, Routledge

Mok, K. H. 2007.' The quest for world class status: University Responses and Strategies in Asia'. *The Journal of Comparative Asian Development* 6(1) pp. 1-20

Mok, K. H. 2007. Questing for Internationalization of Universities in Asia: critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11 (3-4) pp. 437

Mok K.H. & Lee H.H. 1999. 'Education should not be a top down process'. *Hong Kong Economic Journal* 1999

Mok, K.H. & Welch, A. 2003. (Eds) *Globalisation and Educational Restructuring in the Asia Pacific Region.* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Mok, K.H. & Lo, W. 2009. 'The growing importance of the privateness in education: challenges for higher education governance in China'. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 39 (1) pp. 35- 4

Moodie, G. 2007. 'Changing Higher Education'. *Minerva* 45(1) pp.73-84

Niven, M. 2007. Intensive Interview at Dfes (London). Marie Niven is Head of International Programmes and Education Exports, Joint International Unit.

Ngok, K. and Guo, W. 2007. ' The Quest for World class Universities in China: critical reflections'. *The Journal of Comparative Asian Development* 6(1) pp. 21-44

O'Connel Davidson, J. and Layder, D. 1994. *Methods, Sex and Madness*. London Routledge

Ohmae, K. 1990. *The Borderless World: Power and Srategy in the Interlinked Economy*. New York, Harper Business

Onderwijsraad 2001. *De markt meester? Een verkenning naar marktwerking in het onderwijs*. The Hague: Onderwijsraad.

Office of Public Sector Information 2004. Accessed online, 21/8/2009 at http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2004/ukpga_20040008_en_1

Ozga and Gewirtz 1994. 'Sex, Lies and Videotape: interviewing the Educational Policy Elite' in Halpin,D. and Troyna B. (Eds) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological issues.* The Falmer Press

Palfreyman, D. 2001. in Warner, D. and Palfreyman, D. (Eds) *The State of UK Higher Education.* Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and Oxford University Press

Pawson, R. 2000. Middle Range Realism. *Archives European Sociology* XLI (2) pp.283-325.

Phillips, D. 2008. Intensive interview at Lingnan University.

Polanyi, M. and Prosch, H. 1975. *Meaning*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Poon, A.Y.K., and Wong, Y.C. 'Institutional Disarticulation: The changing Educational Governance in Post-Handover Hong Kong'. *Centre for Asian Pacific Studies Working Papers.* Hong Kong, Lingnan University

Post, D. 2008. WUN seminar: *HE: Equity and Access: The Hong Kong Transformation.* March 7th 2008

Postiglione, G. & Mak, G.1997 (Eds) *Asian Higher Education: An international Handbook and Reference Guide* Greenwood Press, Conn.

Pounds, R. 1968. *The Development of Education in Western Culture.* New York,

Appleton

Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. 1991. (Eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* London, The University of Chicago Press

Punch, K. 2005. *Introduction to Social Research.* London, Sage

Roberts, P.W. and Dowling, G.R. 2002. 'Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance'. *Strategic Management Journal* 23 pp. 1077-1093

Robertson, S. 2009. *Globalising the 'Bologna Process': Looking Closely at the Europe's 'Looking Out' Strategy for Higher Education.* WUN virtual seminar,15/5/09

Robertson,S. Bonal, X, and Dale, R. 2002 : 'Gats and the Education Service Industry: The Politics of Scale and Global Reterritorialization'.*Comparative Education Review*: 46 (4) pp. 472-496

Robbins Report: 1963 Committee on Higher Education. *Higher Education Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-1963*. London: HMSO.

Rodzinski, W. 1999. *A History of China.* London, Pergamon Press

Rouse, B. and Garcia, D. 2004. 'Moving up the Rankings'. *Information Knowledge Systems Management* 4(3) pp. 139-147

Sadlak, J. & Liu, N.C. 2007. *The world-class university and ranking: Aiming beyond status.*

Sadlak, J., Merisotis, J. and Liu, N. C.2008. 'University Rankings: Seeking Prestige, Raising Visibility and Embedding Quality - the Editors' Views' *Higher Education in Europe* 33 (2) 195-199

Said, E.W. 1978. *Orientalism.* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Salter, B. & Tapper, T. 1994. *The State and Higher Education.* Essex, Woburn Press

Samil, J. 2008. *The Challenge of Establishing World Class Universities.* Washington D.C., World Bank Publications

Sastry, T. 2004. *Postgraduate Education in the United Kingdom.* Higher Education Policy Institute

Sayer, A. 1992. *Methods in social science: A Realist approach.* London and New York, Routledge

Sayer, A. 1997. Critical realism and the limits to critical social science. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 27 (4) pp.473-488.

Sayer, A. 2000. *Realism and social science.* London, Sage Publications.

Schachner, N. 1938. *The Mediaeval Universities.* Perpetua, New York

Scott, D. 2007. Intensive Interview at Dfes (London) 13/02/07 (Dominic Scott is the Chief Executive UKCOSA)

Scott, P. 2001 in 2001 in Warner, D. & Palfreyman, D. (Eds) *The State of UK Higher Education.* Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and OUP

Shannon, W. 2009. *National Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in New Zealand: A Comparative Analysis. A Masters Dissertation,* University of Canterbury accessed online at http://ir.canterbury.ac.nz on 18/3/2010

Shattock, M. 1994. *The UGC and the Management of British Universities.* Bristol PA, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press

Simmons, R. 2001. 'Questionnaires'. in Gilbert, N. (Ed.) *Researching Social Life.* London, Sage

Skolnic, M. 2009. *Quality assessment in higher education as a political process.* A WUN virtual seminar, 29/5/09

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University.* Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press

Slopes, D. 2007. Intensive interview in Hong Kong.(Derek Slopes is a senior lecturer at a university in Hong Kong)

Stevens, R. 2004. *University to Uni: The Politics of Higher Education in England since 1944.* Methuan, London

Stensaker, B. and Norgard, J. 2001. 'Innovation and isomorphism: A case-study of university identity and struggle'. *Higher Education* 42: 473–492

Stiglitz, J. 2002. *Globalisation and its discontents.* London, Penguin

Stiles, D. R. 2002 *'Higher Education Funding Council (HEFC) methods in the 1990s: national and regional developments and policy implications'. Public Administration* 80 (4) pp.711-731

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA,Sage

So, A. and Chiu, S. 1995. *East Asia and the world economy. Ca,* Sage

Sung, Y. 1995. *'Patterns of economic interdependence in the natural economic territory'.* in J. Khanna (Ed.) *Southern China, Hong Kong and Taiwan.* Washington, D.C: Centre for Strategic and International Studies

Taylor, J. 2002. 'Changes in Teaching and Learning in the Period to 2005: the case of postgraduate higher education in the UK'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 24 (1) pp. 53-73

Taylor, J. 2004. 'Toward a Strategy for Internationalisation: Lessons and Practice from Four Universities'. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8 (2) pp.149-171

Teng, S. & Fairbank, J. 1954. *China's Response to the West.* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press

THES 2009. Accessed online on 6/10/2009 at www.timeshighereducation.co.uk

Turner, D. 2005. 'Benchmarking in universities: league tables revisited'. *Oxford Review of Education* 31 (3) pp. 353–371

UGC 1996. *Higher Education in Hong Kong.*

UGC 2004. *Higher Education in Hong Kong To Make a Difference; To Move with the Times.*

Usher A., & Massimo, S. 2006. 'A World of Difference: A Global Survey of University League Tables'. *Canadian Education Report Series.* Educational Policy Institute . Accessed online at http://www.educationalpolicy.org

Vaira, M. 2004. Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education* 48 (4) pp. 483-510

Vaira, M. 2009. *Towards Unified and Stratified Systems of Higher Education* in Kehm, B. Stensaker, B. 2009. *University Rankings, Diversity and the New Landscape of Higher Education.* Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, Sense

van der Wende, M. C. 2003. 'Globalisation and Access to Higher Education'. *Journal of Studies in International Education.* 7 (2) pp. 193-206

Verger, A and Bonal, X. 2006. 'Against Gats: the sense of a Global Struggle'. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies 4 (1)*

Wang, Y.C. 1966. *Chinese Intellectuals and the West 1872-1949.* Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press

Warner, D. and Palfreyman, D. (Eds) 2001 *The State of UK Higher Education.* Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and Oxford University Press

Warren, C. 2004 'Interviewing in Qualitative Research' in Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A. and Liao, T. *Statistical Research Methods.* California, Sage

Waters, M. 1995. *Globalization.* London, Routledge

Watson M. and Hay C. 2003. 'The discourse of globalisation and the logic of no alternative: rendering the contingent necessary in the political economy of New Labour'. *Policy & Politics* 31 (3) 1 pp. 289-305

Wilensky, H., 1975. *The Welfare State and Equality*: *Structural and Ideological Roots of Public Expenditures*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press

Winston, G. C. 1999. 'Subsidies, hierarchy, and peers: The awkward economics of higher education'. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13 (1), pp. 13–36.

Weimer, D. L. and Vining, A. R. 1999. *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

World Bank, 1993 *The East Asian Miracle.* Washington D.C., World Bank Publications

Wu, P.L. 1964. *The development of Taiwan education from 1945 – 1968.* Unpublished PdD, New York University, New York

Wu, K.B. 1992. *Higher Education: Investment in Science and Technology in a time of political and economic change.* Washington, D.C., World Bank Publications

Wu, X. 2005. 'Yuelu Academy: Landscape and gardens of neo-Confucian pedagogy' *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes* 25 (3) pp. 37-72

Yang, R. 2003 'Globalisation and Higher Education Development: a Critical Analysis'. *International Review of Education* 49 (3-4) 269-291

Yang, R. 2009. *'Enter the Dragon? China's Higher Education Returns to the World Community: The Case of Peking University Personnel Reforms'.* WUN virtual seminar. 20/4/2009

Yeh, M.D. 1995. 'Ask a Tiger for its hide? Taiwan's approaches to economic transactions across the Straits'. *Southern China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan: Evolution of a Sub-regional Economy.* Washington D.C., Centre for Strategic and International Studies

Yen Mah, A. 1997. *Falling Leaves.* London, Penguin

Yin, R., 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London, Sage .

Yorke, M. 1997. 'A good league guide? *Quality Assurance in Education* 5(2) pp. 61–72

Zairi, M. 1998. *Benchmarking for best practice: continuous learning through sustainable innovation.* Oxford, Butterworth Heinemann

Zhou, J. 2006. *Higher Education in China.* Singapore, Thomson

Zou, Y. 2007. Intensive interview at Zhongshan University, 3/9/07

Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview Schedule and Rationale

Building an international reputation and the resulting governance changes

(BIR = Building an International Reputation, R = rationale for this question, GT = Governance Theory)

Section 1: General Questions/The Institution/Personal contexts

- Your context? What is important in your professional life.... two or three things which are uppermost on your professional mind?
  Rationale = the interview with TMTU Pres/scoping study.

- What is the legal status of the university?

- Is the university a member of a consortium?

- Are there benchmarking arrangements with other universities? How is this done? Through whom?

- Would you agree with the statement that university strategy is developed above the level of faculty, and that strategies are operationalised by faculty and departments?
  R = More emphatic leadership styles/GT (Marginson & Considine 2000, Chapter 4 and page 234)

Section 2: Questions regarding the Faculty

- How many faculty academic staff/departments do you have?
  What is the structure of the faculty?

- How many associate/deputy Deans are there? What are their portfolios?

- Does the faculty have a devolved budget?
  R = adapted from McDaniel 1996/autonomy/GT

- Are there competitive research funds in the faculty?

- Is the faculty free to have interaction with overseas institutions without approval?
  R = adapted from McDaniel 1996/autonomy/GT

- Is the faculty free to determine its own internal administrative arrangements without approval, for example HR?
  R = adapted from McDaniel 1996/autonomy/GT

- Is the faculty free to select students and to determine courses, and the content of courses without approval?
  R = adapted from McDaniel 1996/autonomy/GT

- Is the faculty free to appoint staff without approval? What do you do with underachievers?
  R = adapted from McDaniel 1996/autonomy/GT

Section 3: Core Variables / Changes in Practice / Role of the Dean

- Has the faculty been subject to organisational change in the 5 years?
  R= Rapidly changing 'revolving door 'governance'/GT(Marginson & Considine 2000, Chapter 4 and page 234)

- Have you perhaps taken on a more prominent role in working closely with your HoDs than your predecessors in terms of their planning and direction?
  R = The more emphatic leadership styles and the sidelining of collegiate structures/GT (Marginson & Considine 2000, Chapters 4 and 5 and page 234).
  R = top down institutional steering element of GT
  R = A VC spoke of "getting a bit more intrusive" with regard to steering departments in the way of strategies they were developing and decisions they were making, and of an increase in 'inrusive'-ness (Lucas 2006:85)

- What strategies have you employed to build/enhance the faculty's International/ Reputation?

- Which of these have been most/least successful?

- What are your views on the visits which Deans/others make to other Universities, and which they host, for relationship building/visibility of the faculty? Are you involved in such visits?
  R = Scoping study, response from HK Dean

- Are there changes to recruitment practices to enhance reputation
  - pay premia
  - Is the faculty free to determine academics'pay without appproval?
  - using an academics name though he/she may not be visible

  R = adapted from McDaniel/autonomy

- How important is building the physical environment of the faculty/university?
  R = my observations in UK/HK

- Are organisational changes needed to enhance reputation?
  - how is HR handled...Uni/Fac/Dept
  - schoolification
  - centralised p/g admin
  - p/g schools
  - Communicating with international students eg quality web site?

R = Scoping study, UK Dean and admin staff on p/g schoolification

- Are there changes to recruitment practices to enhance reputation
  - pay premia
  - Is the faculty free to determine academics'pay without appproval?
  - using an academics name though he/she may not be visible

R = adapted from McDaniel/autonomy
R = top down institutional steering element of GT

Section 4: Core Variables/Attitudes to IRB

- What is your view of the significance of the institutions/faculty reputation/international reputation?
  R = UK PVC scoping study
  R = related to the international element of governance theory (GT)

- What is your view of the efforts to enhance reputation?
  R = Follow on from the above

- How significant are league tables in this regard? Have there been attempts to deconstruct league tables at this university/faculty in order to see the way forward?
  R = Scoping study, UK Dean

- Who is driving these efforts to enhance reputation? Is it MoE, VC/President, SMT?
  R = the discourses regarding the role of the nation state/developmental state/competition state, and the international/pluri-scalar element of governance theory (GT)

- Where does IRB come on your priority list? Is BIR discernible from other processes going on?
  R = much literature comments on the competing demands faced by HE managers

- What purposes does reputation serve?
  - local
  - international
  - allows international research proposals

R= brings in the geographical scale approach to GT

- What changes have you noticed over the last 5 years regarding BIR, and where is it going over the next 5 years? Are things getting more difficult? Do you think it might reach a stage where you might want to drop out of the race?

- What is the size and scope of competition?
  - academics
  - students

- local
- national
- with Beida, Ivy league, Oxbridge etc

R = the 'competition state' discourse

- How is BIR linked to the idea of the world-class university?

- Do you embrace this idea of the World Class university?

- Over what issues do you ignore BIR, eg Teaching?

Section 5: Core Variables/Changes in Practise/Research/Teaching and Internationalisation

- Do you engage in the following research strategies?

  - Creating areas of new research strength
    - Making new appointments in those areas
    - Encouraging groupings of staff in those areas, new Research Centres

  - Managing and organisation
    - Having a departmental research committees
    - Monitoring and mentoring the research work of staff
    - Creating time for research, by reducing other responsibilities
    - Providing start up funds for staff research
    - Holding a data base for information on research activities and setting research targets

  - Research environment and culture
    - Encouraging applications for research grants (research consultants)
    - Encouraging staff to publish, and requiring certain publications
    - Encouraging all forms of research publicity including attendance at conferences
    - Increasing numbers of p/g's
    - Invitations for international colleagues
    - Encouraging a departmental research culture with seminars, conferences etc

  - Do you feel you are in competition with other faculties?

R= since these are research-intensive universities, it is necessary to dwell on the organisation/administration of research in the faculty (Lucas 2006:131)

- How has the emphasis upon and the administration of teaching developed during the last five years?

  - Do students feedback regarding the teaching of each course?
  - How is this feedback, where it exists, managed?

- Do you think there is a responsiveness to students' needs?
- Are there expectations regarding length of feedback to student assignents?
- Regular e-mail reminders about deadlines?
- Has there been a relaxation of marking standards?
- Are there targets for return of assignments?
- Is there a relationship between teaching and reputation management?

R = Scoping study, UK Lecturer, students in Taiwan

- Are there attempts to grow a client based culture?
  - Admin staff/training in client friendly approach
  - Academic staff /training in client friendly approach

R = Scoping study, UK admin staff

- How has Internationalisation proceeded at this institution in the last decade?

  - Academic programs (eg, student exchanges, work and study abroad, staff exchanges)
  - Position regarding overseas students/numbers/targets
  - Research collaboration
  - Expressed interest/goals of SMT
  - Central support for international operations
  - Global searches for staff
  - Campus events
  - Recruitment issues

R= scoping study: Interview with IoT staff. Knight 2004: 23-9

Appendix 2: Consent Letter

Centre for East Asian Studies
University of Bristol
4 Priory Rd
Bristol
BS8 1TY U.K.
January 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Consent to participate in academic research

Thank you for taking time to read this letter. It sets out the nature of my research and seeks your consent to participate in an interview for about an hour. In some cases I might request a further interview.

Allow me to introduce myself: I am a PhD student at the University of Bristol (UK), and am based at the Centre for East Asian Studies. I am researching into the effects of internationalisation in higher education institutions. It is a comparative study, involving institutions in China and the UK. Specifically, the research asks whether staff perceive that the internationalisation of their institution is changing the way their department or faculty operates, and if so, in what ways. Although this is overt research, in that it is intended that it will be published as a doctoral thesis and in academic journals, the anonymity of all participants and institutions will be preserved. Anything you say will be treated confidentially.

My supervisors at the University are Professors Roger Dale (r.dale@bristol.ac.uk) and Yongjin Zhang (Yongjin.Zhang@bris.ac.uk). Professor Zhang can be contacted at the above address, while Professor Dale's address is:

Graduate School of Education
5 Berkeley Square
Bristol
BS8 1JA U.K.

Please feel free to ask any questions about the nature of the research. If you agree to participate I would ask you to sign this letter below, acknowledging that you have understood the intentions of the research.
Yours faithfully

Paul Morrissey paul.morrissey@bristol.ac.uk 07900357701

I have understood the nature of the research outlined above and agree to participate. I understand that everything I say will be treated confidentially, I may withdraw from the research and I may see a copy of the transcript of any interview/s in which I am involved.

Signed_____Date _____

Appendix 3: Respondents at the Case Study Universities

CR1	Assistant Professor, IoC
CR2	Lecturer, Chinese Studies, IoC
CR3	Director of Research Centre, IoC
CR4	Lecturer, School of Government, IoC
CR5	PhD student, IoC
CR6	Assistant Professor, School of Political Science, IoC
CR7	Dean, School of Education, IoC
C R8	Dean, School of Political Science, IoC
C R9	PhD student, IoC
C R10	Assistant Professor, IoC
C R11	Assistant Professor, IoC
HKR1	Dean, Social Sciences, IoHK
HKR2	Assistant Dean, Social Sciences, IoHK
HKR3	Vice-President, a university in Hong Kong
HKR4	Dean, Social Sciences, a university in Hong Kong
HKR5	Associate Professor of Asian Studies, a university in Hong Kong
HKR6	Director of International Affairs, a university in Hong Kong
HKR7	Associate Professor of Political Science, a university in Hong Kong.
TR1	Dean of International Affairs, IoT
TR2	Senior Administrator, IoT
TR3	Assistant Dean, Chinese Studies, IoT
TR4	Assistant Professor, School of Economics, IoT
TR5	Dean, School of Social Work, IoT
TR6	Assistant Professor, IoT
TR7	Dean/Director of Zoology, IoT
TR8	Dean, Office of Research and Development, IoT
TR9	Deputy Dean of College of Management IoT
TR10	PhD student, IoT
TR11	PhD student, IoT
UKR1	Dean of Social Sciences, IoUK
UKR2	Dean Elect of Social Sciences, IoUK
UKR3	Previous Dean of Social Sciences, IoUK
UKR4	Pro-Vice Chancellor, IoUK2
UKR5	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Arts, IoUK
UKR6	Professor, School of Politics, IoUK

Appendix 4: an exemplar of an interview transcription and the coding/memo-ing process

Explanation: Below are the codes for analysis, as described on page 75, in Chapter 4. The intention of the first query was to examine the suggestion emerging from the literature that the nation state is increasingly a site of competition with other state. The second and third queries sought to examine whether there was any evidence at the case study institutions that there was awareness of or influence from the league tables in general and global league tables in particular, and whether re-organisation or governance change was proceeding, and whether such changes, if they existed, might be related to the aforementioned competition and league tables. The second section comprises five queries, which seek data relating respectively regarding the management responsibilities of the Dean, strategies for reputation building, the research culture of the institution, the process of internationalisation, and the teaching culture at the case study institutions. These are coded as shown below:

1.1: the context of (global/regional/international) competition
1.2: a context of league tables
1.3: a context of organisational change

2.1: the role of the Dean
2.2: strategies for reputation building
2.3: the research culture of the institution
2.4: the process of internationalisation
2.5: the teaching culture

In the interview transcription below, codes and memos are in italics

Interview with TR1, IoC, April 2009

Note : TR1 is involved with the development of Internationalisation at IoT. Also present was TR2, a middle ranking civil servant, employed by the MoE, who headed up the co-ordination process between IoT and the MoE

TR1: my colleague tells me you are interested in internationalisation?

Paul: Yes, what's your view about the process at this university? Is internationalisation essential from your perspective? - I think it's something people go a bit crazy about at the moment. What is its purpose? – a game, a competition – jumping on the bandwagon?

TR1: Internationalisation needs to be carefully monitored – but we need to move on at a fast pace – as a small island, we need to keep up or we will not survive *(1.1)*. Mutual respect and understanding are very important. I visited Cambridge 2 years ago – a

professor there said why the need to internationalise (he was an anthropologist)? It's hard for me to understand that viewpoint

IoT is not in a consortium.

Paul: Let's go back a little; perhaps you could tell me about one or two things that concern you, or perhaps excite you, in your current role?

TR1: I have deep concern in terms of development of internationalisation in this university. It's the oldest university in Taiwan; founded by the Japanese; the biggest in terms of numbers; almost the same ration of undergraduate as postgraduate; a strong research orientation *(useful for Institutional background?).* The campus is also the biggest – we own 1% of this island! (Agriculture – experimental forest – good resource for studies eg biodiversity.) These are research assets. In the past 3 years, the government has launched a new project – aiming for top university initiatives *(1.3: organisational change at MoE level?).* They chose 12 universities but only 2 received larger funding – IoT received one third of funding, and a university in the south received a large amount. (Then a 13th university secretary general did a hunger strike in front of the Ministry of Education – he felt so strongly that his university should be included). 3 Billion NT dollars extra funding for IoT; this is a big help in internationalisation.

Since we have this project, we have wider exposure and it shows the determination, from the university and from the government, to promote ourselves. We are very determined to promote ourselves. I visit international conferences and partner universities. Every time we have an international conference, other institutions feel we are a better partner to collaborate with *(1.1: the imperative to compete).*

Also, this project means we are a nuclear centre – we attract a lot more attention from the business world, even outside Taiwan *(2.4: the impact on funding of exposure).* Entrepreneur Terry Guo (Fox Company, Foscom) (Hunghai in Taiwan) donated 15 billion Taiwanese dollars to IoT last year, to set up a research centre and cancer hospital, and asked NTU to spend two thirds of the donation within 2 years. So we have to complete this building within 2 years on this site.

It's an M shaped society; rich at one end, poor at the other; the middle class disappears. I think that universities are now M shaped *(1.1: the results of increased competition on stratification within national systems).* But IoT is in a good situation; many other universities can't get donations. So these 2 things are exciting – the 5 year MOE project, and the many donations.

Last month I was in Australia; APRU – the Association of Pacific Ring Universities – has 42 members, and IoT is the only one from Taiwan. Other universities, eg Kyoto and Osaka, came to me and want collaboration over the new cancer research centre *(2.4: the opportunities for international collaboration resulting from exposure and research*

facilities... a positive inertia). George Bush rejected research on stem cells, but Kyoto has done a lot on this.

But I also have negative feelings: frustration at Taiwan's political situation. Taiwan is a very small island, and unfortunately is next to mainland China *(1.1: in the shadow of the giant)*; though culturally we have strong affinity to China, still we are now so different from Chinese people, politically, philosophically. As we are next door to them, after the 1980s, all the Western world goes to China to seek for collaboration or seek to send students there. Not only in the aspect of research, but also regarding internationalisation, we are much better than China, but everyone goes *there* for international collaboration. We are by-passed. There are practical hurdles, eg we are not a member of the UN. I have travelled abroad 4 times in the last month – I have to do this, whereas China doesn't. Other Taiwanese universities don't do it either – they just enjoy the wider exposure – they haven't got to the level of 'practical battlefield' for top universities to fight for... *(1.1/2.4: frustration regarding Taiwan's position)*

Harvard, MIT go to Zhejiang, not to NTU. I have to fight for Taiwan as well as for NTU.

Paul: That must be very frustrating. Actually, could I ask a more prosaic question about university organisation? I noticed from the organisational chart which you gave me at the start of this interview, well I have a query...

TR1: Let me explain... The university senate consists of internal personnel of the university and has the final vote on most issues. There are 166 (or is it 168?) on the senate; professors from different colleges. The core group is the president, deans etc. I have the right to speak but not to vote. The remaining 150 or so were elected by individual colleges. Deans are members. Yes, the Deans of colleges are appointed by the President *(2.1)*.

There are 3 vice presidents: one for research, one for administration, one for fundraising. (See booklet, and corrections on chart.) *(Useful for Institutional background)*

20 years ago the Nobel prize Laureate, Professor Li, said that professors should be on the committees. All these committees are run by professors, so it's the university democratic procedure *(1.3: organisational change, and fits in with context chapter)*. TR2 will go through this chart with you after this meeting, is that OK, TR2?

Paul: What is the legal position of the university as a whole?

TR1: Not yet corporatisation. The Ministry of Education just published a paper saying there were a lot of hurdles. It's a hot topic; IoT is the role model for everything in Taiwan. 4 years ago, we had a new president – he conducted deep research into corporatisation, and collected information from different universities.

I visited Japan to learn and listen; after corporatisation, the government reduced the budget by 1% per year… in Japan. And for Japan's top universities, they could always get money, but Hokkaido and other universities, it was not so easy *(useful for background.. note the frequent reference to Japan).*

In Taiwan, IoT can always get enough from entrepreneurs, etc… but the others? After this research into corporatisation, talk slowed down a bit, especially with the global financial crisis. Right now, this university's budget (as a public university, 80% of budget should be provided by the government) only gets about 38%, and the remainder (40-something %) comes from research projects (government and business world, private sectors) and the rest (a small amount, 14/15%) from tuition fees. (plus a bit from our own businesses.) So not yet autonomous; still under very strict control from Ministry.

Paul: How about the time frame: you've both been here about 4 years … have you noticed any policy changes in that time policy change?

TR1: I think it was one year earlier – so about 5 years ago – internationalisation became very important. So the president decided to make it a priority. 2003, that was when we signed up to the WTO – and 2004, that was when the Shanghai Jiaotong ranks were published. I cannot give you a logical explanation *(1.2: must take this further).*

2004 – the Prime Minister of Taiwan noticed that because Taiwan had a very good IT business, we need to have more electronics – copy the model of the USA – need more electronic engineers. He launched a recruitment of international students – high technology engineers. Bit 'stumbling' now – realise that internationalisation is now 'core'.

Appendix 5: Abbreviations and Acronyms

DVC Deputy Vice Chancellor

EU European Union

FTA Free Trade Agreement

GATS General Agreement on Trade in Services

HE Higher Education

HEI Higher Education Institute

HEPI Higher Education Policy Institute

HK Hong Kong

HKSAR Hong Kong Special Administrative Area

HOD Head of Department

IMF International Monetary Fund

KE Knowledge Economy

MOE Ministry of Higher Education

MoU Memorandum of Understanding

NPM New Public Management

PRC People's Republic of China

RAE Research Assessment Exercise

TNHE Trans National Higher Education

WTO World Trade Organization

UGC University Grants Committee

UK United Kingdom

UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

US United States

VC Vice Chancellor